

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

H CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMEYER

KEMP MALONE

RAYMOND D HAVENS

HAZELTON SPENCER

C S. SINGLETON

---

VOLUME LV

1940

---

BALTIMORE

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

1940

# TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME LV

	PAGE
Françon, Marcel, Marot au Châtelet	1
Koenig, V F, Counter-Notes on Jean Renart	8
Spitzer, Leo, Rassisch nationale Stilkunde	16
Fitch, G B, <i>Favras</i> and Hugo's <i>Marie Tudor</i>	24
Havens, G R, The Dates of Diderot's Birth and Death	31
Borish, M E, A Second Version of John Day's <i>Peregrinatio Scholastica</i>	35
McGing, Margaret E, A Possible Source for the Female Disguise in Byron's <i>Don Juan</i>	39
Booth, B A, Moore to Hobhouse an Unpublished Letter	42
Wilcox, S C, A Manuscript Addition to Hazlitt's Essay "On the Fear of Death"	45
Wecter, Dixon, Burke's Error Regarding Sugar Crystals	47
Reese, Harold, A Borrower from Quarles and Herbert	50
Potter, G R, Donne's Paradoxes in 1707	53
Bernbaum, Ernest, Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800	54
Blair, Lawrence, A Note on the Relation of the Corpus Christi Procession to the Corpus Christi Play in England	83
Kocher, P H, The English <i>Faust Book</i> and the Date of Marlowe's <i>Faustus</i>	95
Wells, S B, <i>Love's Labour's Lost</i> , iv, iii, 285-362	102
Gilbert, A H, Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Censorinus	103
Lancaster, H C, Is <i>la Coupe enchantée</i> by La Fontaine or Champmeslé?	105
Holmes, U T, Jr, <i>Pathelin</i> , 1519-1522	106
Cadwalader, John, Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare Manuscript	108
Bowers, R H, The Text of <i>Grobian's Nuptials</i>	109
Bang, C K, Haller and Wieland	110
Walz, John A, <i>Hezenfeyen Faust II</i> , L 6199	117
Mautner, F H, Lichtenbergs Vortrag über die Charaktere in der Geschichte und sein Gesamtwerk	123
Gillet, J E, A Note on the <i>Lazarillo de Tormes</i>	130
Armstrong, E C, OFr <i>Chaufreyn</i> and OFr -MFr <i>Chanfreyn</i>	134
Bazell, C E, Case-Forms in -i in the Oldest English Texts	136
Shook, L K, Notes on the Old-English Charms	139
Malone, Kemp, The Myrtingas of <i>Widsith</i>	141
Pratt, R A, Chaucer's <i>Shipman's Tale</i> and Sercambi	142
Von der Muhll, E, Rousseau et les réformateurs du théâtre	161
Grubbs, H A, An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy	
J B Rousseau as an Imitator of Ben Jonson	170
MacMillan, Dougald, Some Notes on Eighteenth-Century Essex Plays	176
Baird, J R, Milton and Edward Ecclestone's <i>Noah's Flood</i>	183
Logan, J V, Wordsworth and the Pathetic Fallacy	187
Jones, Alice E, A Note on Charles Hopkins (c 1671-1700)	191
Pettit, Henry, The Dating of Young's <i>Night Thoughts</i>	194



	PAGE
Fox, Bernice, Revision in Browning's <i>Paracelsus</i>	195
Snyder, Edward D, A Note on R L S	197
Guérard, Albert, Jr, The Dates of Some of Robert Bridges' Lyrics	199
Knickerbocker, W S, Arnold, Shelley, and Joubert	201
Atkins, Stuart, <i>Urfaust</i> I 309	201
Whitbread, L, Four Text-Notes on <i>Deor</i>	204
Savage, Henry, Arcite's Maying	207
Brown, C S, Jr and R H West, "As by the Whelp Chastised Is the Leon"	209
Cooley, Franklin, William Taylor of Norwich and <i>Beowulf</i>	210
Gunnagh, Kevin, Source of the Quotation from Augustine in <i>The Parson's Tale</i> , 985	211
Menner, Robert J, Notes on Middle English Lyrics	243
Mary Immaculate, Sister, A Note on "A Song of the Five Joys"	249
Henkin, Leo J, Jacob and the Hooly Jew	254
Kunstmann, John G, Chaucer's Archangel	259
Caldwell, Robert A, Chaucer's <i>Taillynge Ynough</i> , <i>Canterbury Tales</i> , B <sup>2</sup> 1624	262
Livingston, Charles H, English <i>Funk</i>	265
Warner, James H, The Basis of J-J Rousseau's Contemporaneous Reputation in England	270
Bell, Clan Hayden, Was there a <i>Meistersingerschule</i> at Danzig?	280
Furst, Norbert, The Conclusion of Keller's <i>Gruener Heinrich</i>	285
Staufer, Donald A, A Parasitical Form of Biography	289
Allen, Robert J, Contemporary Allusions in <i>The Tatler</i>	292
Friedman, Arthur, Goldsmith and Steele's <i>Englishman</i>	294
Wasserman, Earl R, The Source of Motherwell's <i>Melancholye</i>	296
Shields, A K, García Gutiérrez's Birth-Date	296
Bandy, W T, A Self-Estimate by Baudelaire	297
Hatcher, Anna G, The Rise and Fall of <i>s'écrier</i> in French	323
Spitzer, Leo, <i>Le Manque d'argent qui se fait rare</i>	332
Fenimore, Edward, A Monetary Question in <i>Gautier d'Aupais</i> ?	338
Estrich, Robert M, A Possible Provençal Source for Chaucer's <i>House of Fame</i> , 300-310	342
Tatlock, J S P, Chaucer's Monk	350
Hornstein, Lillian H, Trivet's Constance and the <i>King of Tars</i>	354
Rosenfeld, Mary-Virginia, Chaucer and the Liturgy	357
Atkinson, Dorothy F., Some Further Chaucer Allusions	361
Webster, K. G T, Galloway and the Romances	363
Gallacher, Stuart A, "Einem den Hahnenfusz unterbreiten"	366
Blenner-Hassett, Roland, The English River-Names in Lawman's <i>Brut</i>	373
Richardson, Lewis C, A Note on <i>Chest</i>	378
Sledd, James, Three Textual Notes on Fourteenth-Century Poetry	379
Kirschbaum, Leo, The Sequence of Scenes in <i>Hamlet</i>	382
Stoll, Elmer Edgar, Poetic Alliteration	388

# CONTENTS

v

	PAGE
Bennett, Josephine W, Churchyard's Description of the Queen's Entertain- ment at Woodstock in 1592	391
Tupper, Fred S, Colley and Caus Cibber	393
Shudofsky, M Maurice, <i>The Gentleman-Cully</i>	396
Scott Craig, T S K, Milton's Use of Wolleb and Ames	403
Enk, Z S, The Date of Milton's <i>Proposals for a Firme Government</i>	407
Scott, Florence R, The Marriages of Sir Robert Howard	410
Sloane, William, Some Plagiarisms in 17th Century Books of Advice to Children	416
Thomas, Sidney, "Hobgoblin Runne Away with the Garland of Apollo "	418
Roellinger, F X, E S Dallas in Trollope's <i>Autobiography</i>	422
Simison, Barbara D, The Letters of R W Emerson Addenda	425
Braunlich, Alice F, Parallels to Some Passages in <i>Prometheus Unbound</i>	428
Moore, J R, Evidence for Defoe's Authorship of <i>The Memoirs of Captain Carleton</i>	430
Hook, J N, Three Imitations of Spenser	431
Wasserman, E R, Coleridge's "Metrical Experiments"	432
Kurrelmeyer, W, Vier Briefe aus Gleims Freundeskreise	433
Kurrelmeyer, W, Ein Brief Schillers an Anton von Klein	441
Cioranescu, Al, Alphonse de Rambervillers, Ligueur	442
Spitzer, Leo, A Fr <i>Escharevotee 'Écorchée'</i>	447
Mossner, E C, Rousseau Hero Worship	449
Privitera, J F, The Date of Mme Deshoulières's Parody of <i>le Cid</i>	451
Parker, J H, A Possible Source of a <i>jeu de scene</i> in Molière's <i>École des maris</i>	453
Adams, N B and Salley, W C, A Note on the Sources of <i>Venganza Catalana</i>	454
Clarkson, Paul S and Warren, Clyde T, Copyhold Tenure and <i>Macbeth</i> , III, ii, 38	483
Baldensperger, Fernand, Un Sonnet de William Drummond et son point de depart dans <i>la Semaine de Du Bartas</i>	493
Spitzer, Leo, Le Style "circulaire"	495
Havens, George R, Rousseau, Melon, and Sir William Petty	499
Bonno, G, Un Texte inédit de l'abbé Leblanc sur les <i>Lettres philo- sophiques</i> de Voltaire	503
Silz, Walter, A "Falsified Verse" in Kleist's <i>Homburg'</i>	505
Eastman, C W, Goethe's <i>An den Mond</i>	509
Schneider, Heinrich, Der Drucker des <i>Hessischen Landboten</i>	512
Singer, A E, Flaubert's <i>Une Nuit de Don Juan</i>	516
Jones, Malcolm B, Translations of Zola in the United States Prior to 1900	520
Norman, Hilda L, A Note on Leopardi's <i>Bruto Minore</i>	524
Colmore, F D, The Date of Machiavelli's <i>Mandragola</i>	526
Beall, C B, Un Recueil italianisant du XVIII <sup>e</sup> siècle français	528
Levy, Raphael, The Plural Usage in Judaeo-French	532

	PAGE
Buhler, Curt F, <i>Lydgate's Horse, Sheep and Goose</i> and Huntington MS HM 144	563
Stoll, E E, Modesty in the Audience	570
Kleinschmidt, J R, The Date of the <i>Cid</i> in English	575
Hutton, James Three Notes on French Authors Desportes, Guérout, Ronsard	579
Woodbridge, B M, Rousseau and Faust	581
Bird, C W, Three Sources of Vigny's <i>Journal</i>	583
Baker, Carlos, A Note on Shelley and Milton	585
Ralph, P L, References to the Drama in the Mildmay Diary	589
Lumiansky, R M, Milton's English Again	591
Sledd, James, <i>Hause and Slaves in King Lear</i>	594
Magoun, F P, Jr, On Six Old Icelandic Words	596
Sturtevant, A M, Gothic <i>þis þis-er, -uh, þis þis-uh, anþar</i> <i>anþar uh</i> , etc	599
Laird, Charleton, A Fourteenth Century Scribe	601
Savage, Henry L, A Note on <i>Sir Gawain</i> 1795	604
Crosby, H L, Jr, Two Notes on <i>Beowulf</i>	605

## REVIEWS

Julius Petersen, Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung [ <i>Archer Taylor</i> ]	65
Georg Bondi (pub), Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal [ <i>E Fesse</i> ]	67
S Battaglia (ed), Boccaccio <i>Il Filocolo</i> , V Branca (ed), Boccaccio <i>Le Rime L'Amorosa Visione La Caccia di Diana</i> [ <i>C S</i> <i>Singleton</i> ]	69
O J Campbell, Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's <i>Troilus and</i> <i>Cressida</i> [ <i>Tucker Brooke</i> ]	71
H Marquardt, Die altenglischen Kenningar [ <i>Kemp Malone</i> ]	73
A Campbell (ed), <i>The Battle of Brunanburh</i> [ <i>Kemp Malone</i> ]	74
G L Kittredge (ed), The Tragedy of <i>Macbeth</i> by William Shake- speare The Tragedy of <i>Julius Caesar</i> by William Shakespeare [ <i>C J Sisson</i> ]	145
M G Walten (ed), Thomas Fuller's <i>The Holy State and the Profane</i> <i>State</i> , W E Houghton, Jr, The Formation of Thomas Fuller's "Holy and Profane States" [ <i>M Y Hughes</i> ]	147
R. B McKerrow, Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare [ <i>H E</i> <i>Rollins</i> ]	150
V. LANGE and H BOESCHENSTEIN, Kulturkritik und Literaturbe- trachtung in Amerika, Y Winters, Primitivism and Decadence [ <i>H Ludeke</i> ]	152
Necip Ūgok, über die Wortgruppen weltanschaulichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Ulfilas [ <i>A W Porterfield</i> ]	154
Homenaje a la memoria del Dr Rodolfo Lenz [ <i>Leo Spitzer</i> ]	156

# CONTENTS

vii

	PAGE
N W Stevenson, Paris dans la <i>Comedie humaine</i> de Balzac [Carlos Lynes, Jr ]	157
Henri Peyre, Hommes et Œuvres du XX <sup>e</sup> siècle [Justin O'Brien ]	158
Arthur Sewell, A Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine [A H Gilbert ]	212
E M W Tillyard, The Miltonic Setting, J S Diekhoff, Milton on Himself [W R Parker ]	215
A W Secord (ed ), Defoe's <i>Review</i> [A D McKillop ]	218
T M H Blair (ed ), <i>The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex</i> By John Banks [A H Nethercot ]	221
W Kelleimann, Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman [Leo Spitzer ]	222
H C Bartlett and A W Pollard, A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709 [G E Dawson ]	226
E K Chambers, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, G McKenzie, Organic Unity in Coleridge [A D Snyder ]	227
Delancy Ferguson, <i>Pride and Passion</i> , Robert Burns 1759-1796 [R T Fitzhugh ]	229
R L Rusk (ed ), The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson [Norman Foerster ]	231
F Olivero, Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater [D A Stauffer ]	232
E M W Tillyard and C S Lewis, The Personal Heresy [George Boas ]	233
B Boyce, Tom Brown of Facetious Memory [G L Day ]	234
C S Lewis, Rehabilitations and Other Essays [R D Jameson ]	235
G J Metcalf, Forms of Address in German (1500-1800) [W. A Kozumplik ]	298
H Sembdner, Die <i>Berliner Abendblätter</i> Heinrich von Kleists [J O Blankenagel ]	301
E M Everett, The Party of Humanity, <i>The Fortnightly Review</i> and Its Contributors, 1865-1874, George Nobbe, <i>The North Briton</i> [Walter Graham ]	302
C L Carlson, The First Magazine, a History of <i>The Gentleman's Magazine</i> [R P McCutcheon ]	305
H G Merriam, Edward Moxon, Dixon Weeter, Edmund Burke and His Kinsmen [B R McElerry, Jr ]	307
Carleton Brown (ed ), Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century [R L Greene ]	308
C F Wheeler, Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of Ben Jonson [O W Lemmi ]	310
Fernand Vial, Une philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de Vauvenargues [B A. Morrisette ]	312
Mary Elizabeth Campbell, Defoe's First Poem [A W Secord ]	314
E N Hooker (ed ), The Critical Works of John Dennis. [L I. Bredvold ]	315

	PAGE
B A Booth (ed ), <i>The Gathering of the West</i> , by John Galt, C J Weber, Rebekah Owen and Thomas Hardy, R Las Vergnas, Joseph Conrad [ <i>J W Beach</i> ]	316
C R Anderson, Melville in the South Seas [ <i>O E Jones</i> ]	318
F L Pattee (ed ), American Writers A Series of Papers Contributed to <i>Blackwood's Magazine</i> (1824-1825) [ <i>H M Jarrell</i> ]	319
M A D Howe, Holmes of the Breakfast-table, L H Wright, American Fiction 1774-1850, H H Clarke (ed ), Six New Letters of Thomas Paine [ <i>Leon Howard</i> ]	400
Mélanges de linguistique romane offerts à M Jean Haust [ <i>Leo Spitzer</i> ]	401
J E Bernard, Jr, The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude, G M Greenewald, Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Catholic Church in <i>King John</i> , J A Mitchell (ed ), <i>The Warde</i> by T Neale, R H West, The Invisible World, B Siebeck, Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys, R Wollenberg, Shakespeare Personliches aus Welt und Werk, J Mair, The Fourth Forger, A K McIlwraith (ed ), Five Elizabethan Tragedies, B Coles, <i>Macbeth</i> , L L Schucking, Die Zusätze zur <i>Spanish Tragedy</i> , The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero, R W Chambers, The Jacobean Shakespeare and <i>Measure for Measure</i> , W Franz, Die Sprache Shakespeares, C N Menon, Shakespeare Criticism, M Van Doren, Shakespeare, T Spencer and M Van Doren, Studies in Metaphysical Poetry, H W Wells, Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights [ <i>T W Baldwin</i> ]	455
J Q Adams (ed ), <i>The Passionate Pilgrim</i> by William Shakespeare [ <i>W W Greg</i> ]	462
E de Selincourt (ed ), The Letters of W and D Wordsworth [ <i>R D Havens</i> ]	464
L Hanson, The Life of S T Coleridge, E L Griggs (ed ), Wordsworth and Coleridge Studies in Honor of G M Harper [ <i>R C Bald</i> ]	466
<i>Lingua Nostra</i> [ <i>Leo Spitzer</i> ]	469
L G Krakeur, La Correspondance de Diderot [ <i>H Dieckmann</i> ]	472
W J Burke, The Literature of Slang [ <i>J L Kuethe</i> ]	473
R Kirk and C M Hall (eds ), <i>Two Bookes of Constancie</i> by I Lipsius [ <i>D O Allen</i> ]	475
G Scheurweghs (ed ), Nicholas Udall's <i>Roister Doister</i> [ <i>R H Bowers</i> ]	476
Hazleton Spencer, The Art and Life of William Shakespeare [ <i>C J Sisson</i> ]	534
F T. Bowers, Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642 [ <i>H Spencer</i> ]	536
G F Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605-1625 [ <i>H Spencer</i> ]	540
Haldor Hermannsson (ed ), The Icelandic <i>Physiologus</i> [ <i>G. T Flom</i> ]	541

# CONTENTS

IX

	PAGE
Archer Taylor, Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries [Carl Selmer]	543
Erik Rooth, <i>Vrasmunt</i> [Carl Selmer]	545
H W Garrod (ed), The Poetical Works of John Keats [O DeW Thorpe]	546
C K Eves, Matthew Prior, Poet and Diplomatist [H B Wright]	548
Louise M Young, Thomas Carlyle and the Art of History [W O Abbott]	550
E A Baker, The History of the English Novel, X [Pelham Edgar]	552
G B Petter, George Meredith and His German Critics [Burges Johnson]	553
A F B Clark, Jean Racine [H O Lancaster]	554
G O Seiver (ed), Antoine de Montchrestien, <i>Aman</i> [H O Lancaster]	555
M Romera-Navarro (ed), <i>El Criticón</i> por Baltasar Gracián [S G Morley]	556
Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature, presented to Mildred K Pope [Grace Frank]	557
J M Manly and Edith Rickert, The Text of the <i>Canterbury Tales</i> [Carleton Brown]	606
A Grégoire, Edmond—Puxi—Michel [H F Muller]	621
H J Green (ed), <i>Anseys de Mes</i> [Leo Spitzer]	624
Luigi Di Benedetto (ed), <i>Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo</i> [C S Singleton]	626
H Gerstner und K Schworm (eds), <i>Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit</i> [E E Miller]	628
J G Robertson, Lessing's Dramatic Theory [R B Roulston]	630
W W Greg (ed), Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Facsimile [J G McManaway]	632
P Phelps Morand, The effects of his political life on John Milton, De Comus à Satan [E M W Tillyard]	635
William Irvine, Walter Bagehot [E B. Burgum]	636
R A E Brooks (ed), Thomas Carlyle, <i>Journey to Germany</i> [Hall Shme]	638
J A S McPeck, Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain [James Hutton]	639

## BRIEF MENTION

Winifred Newton, Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française [H O Lancaster]	76
R H Ball, The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach [H Spencer]	77
J Wilcox, The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy. [H Spencer]	77
V F Hopper, Medieval Number Symbolism [K Malone]	78
J E Wells, A Manual of the Writings in Middle English. [K Malone]	78
N. E Griffin (ed), Guido de Columnis, <i>Historia Destructionis Troiae</i> [K Malone].	78

	PAGE
O Lohmann, Die Sage von <i>Gawain und dem grünen Ritter</i> [J R Hulbert]	159
J J Parry (ed and trans), <i>Brut y Brenhunedd</i> [K Malone]	160
W O Sypherd, The Literature of the English Bible [W Rosenau]	237
Janet C Troxell (ed), Rossetti's <i>Sister Helen</i> [P F Baum]	238
S A Tannenbaum, Ben Jonson (A Concise Bibliography) [M Eccles]	238
M W Black (ed), Elizabethan and Seventeenth-Century Lyrics [R D Havens]	239
Mary S Serjeantson and L N Broughton, Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature [R D Havens]	239
W Murison, Sir David Lyndsay, Poet, and Satirist of the Old Church in Scotland [K Malone]	240
J D A Ogilvy, Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (870-804) [K Malone]	240
J Raith, Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters <i>Palace of Pleasure</i> [K Malone]	241
W Kleineke, Englische Fürstenspiegel vom <i>Poliraticus</i> Johannis von Salisbury bis zum <i>Basiliakon</i> Doron König Jakobs I [K Malone]	241
F Olivero (ed), <i>Beowulf</i> [K Malone]	241
G Hofstrand, <i>The Seege of Troye</i> , A Study [K Malone]	242
H Watson (trans), A Dickson (ed), <i>Valentine and Orson</i> [K Malone]	242
K P Harrington, Richard Alsop, "A Hartford Wit" [A Cowie]	319
A Schinz, Nineteenth Century French Readings [E Malakis]	320
M Sommerfeld (ed), George, Hofmannsthal, Rilke [W Paulsen]	321
R Moley, Are We Movie Made? [A Nicoll]	322
D MacMillan, Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library [A Nicoll]	322
C Neely (collector), J W Spargo (ed), Tales and Songs of Southern Illinois [K Malone]	402
E Panofsky, Studies in Iconology [C S Singleton]	478
A L Reade, Johnsonian Gleanings [F A Pottle]	479
T F Currier (ed), Elizabeth Lloyd and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters [S T Williams]	559
G W Stone, Jr (ed), The Journal of David Garrick Describing his Visit to France and Italy in 1763 [D MacMillan]	560
Ann M Weygandt, Kipling's Reading and its Influence on his Poetry [H Shine]	560
R L Rusk (ed), Letters to Emma Lazarus in the Columbia University Library [F Hard]	561
Mary Beare, The German Popular Play <i>Atis</i> and the Venetian Opera [W Paulsen]	640
H Ten E Perry, Masters of Dramatic Comedy and their Social Themes [H Spencer]	641
R H Barker, Mr Cibber of Drury Lane [H. Spencer]	641
R H Bowers (ed.), <i>The Gast of Gy</i> [K Malone]	642

# CONTENTS

x1

## CORRESPONDENCE

	PAGE
L Spitzer, Robert A Hall, Jr , " Italian Etymological Notes " ( <i>Language</i> , XV, 34 42)	79
W Rehm, Winckelmann	82
B Maxwell, S A Tannenbaum, Bibliographies	160
E P Kuhl, Chaucer's Monk	480
Grace Frank, <i>As by the Whelp Chastised is the Leon</i>	481
E Malakis, Baudelaire and Bandy	482
R Levy, Is <i>Gautier d'Aupais</i> a typical " poème courtois " ?	561





# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LV

JANUARY, 1940

Number 1

---

## MAROT AU CHÂTELET

Clément Marot, arrêté vers la fin de février 1526, fut conduit au Châtelet. De quoi l'accusait-on? D'avoir mangé du lard en Carême, nous dit-on. Six jours après son emprisonnement, Marot écrit une épître "à Monsieur Bouchart, Docteur en Theologie". Le Poète se défend d'être hérétique.

Point ne suis lutheriste  
Ne zuinglien, et moins anabaptiste

Il se demande si le *Docteur Catholique* a une "piquée" contre lui, ou s'il prend "saveur" à l'affliger. Non, dit Marot, c'est "quelque faux entendre" qui t'a rendu si sévère. Puis, dans l'épître à Lyon Jamet, Marot raconte comment le rat a été pris dans une trappe.

pour autant qu'il avoit  
Mange le lard et la chair toute crue

Mais y a-t-il là une allusion à l'accusation portée contre Marot? N'est-il pas naturel d'attraper les rats en les attirant par un morceau de viande?

N'est-il pas possible que Marot, après avoir imaginé de raconter la fable du lion et du rat, se soit servi de ce prétendu grief, pour détourner l'attention, pour montrer qu'on lui reproche une pécadille et que ses juges sont grotesques? On nous dit que c'était un crime que de ne pas observer les règles de l'abstinence pendant le Carême, et on nous rapporte la bulle du 17 mai 1525, où le Pape engageait le pouvoir séculier à sévir contre ceux qui faisaient gras en Carême. Mais ces mesures visaient, on le sait, les luthériens, et ce n'était pas seulement une simple pratique qu'on cherchait à réprimer, mais une foi nouvelle.

L'évêque de Chartres, Louis Guillard, ordonne aux officiers de

son tribunal, le 13 mars 1526, de faire le procès de Marot qui est accusé de plusieurs excès, délits et crimes, et même d'hérésie *de et super nonnullis excessibus delictis et criminibus, etiam heresis*<sup>1</sup> Il n'est, nulle part, mention que Marot ait fait maigre un jour d'abstinence. Mais continuons d'examiner chronologiquement les pièces qui se rapportent à l'incarcération de Marot. Car, à quelle date Marot écrivit-il la ballade *Contre celle qui fut sa mie*? M. Villey<sup>2</sup> remarque qu'il est possible que cette ballade n'ait été écrite que dans la prison de Chartres, où Marot fut transféré, après l'intervention de Louis Guillard. Car, au Châtelet, Marot avait autre chose à faire que d'écrire une ballade à sa belle. Quelle que soit l'époque à laquelle Marot ait composé ce poème,—et on ne le date que d'après l'interprétation qu'on lui prête—c'est là, pour la première fois, dans le refrain qui, nous dit M. Villey, "joue sur un vieux dicton," c'est dans ce refrain que se trouve une allusion à la prétendue accusation portée contre le poète.

Mais en quelle année Marot aurait-il fait gras en Carême? Ce n'est que le 10 juin 1525 qu'une ordonnance avait donné force de loi à la bulle du 17 mai précédent. Marot, semble-t-il, ne pouvait pas être poursuivi pour une faute commise avant cette date. Or, en 1526, le jour de Pâques était le 1<sup>er</sup> avril, c'est dire que le Carême n'a commencé, cette année-là, que le 14 février. M. Becker,<sup>3</sup> malgré les remarques de P. Villey,<sup>4</sup> montre, d'une façon qui paraît concluante, qu'en l'espace de moins d'un mois, il faudrait, si Marot avait été accusé d'avoir fait gras en 1526, placer des événements trop nombreux. "Bruch des Fastengebots, Delation, Haftbefehl und Verhaftung, Einlieferung ins Châtelet und Verhoi, Epistel an Lyon Jamet, Anrufung des Bishofs von Chartres und dessen Erlassz." D'autre part, si l'on n'admet pas que Marot était à Paris, mais si l'on suppose qu'il accompagnait la cour, éloignée de Paris à ce moment, et si l'on tient compte du fait que l'évêque de Chartres

<sup>1</sup> *Clément Marot. Œuvres*, édit. E. G. Guiffrey (Paris, 1911), I, 107.

<sup>2</sup> P. Villey, *Marot et Rabelais* (Paris, 1923), p. 22, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Ph. A. Becker, *Clément Marot, sein Leben und seine Dichtung* [München, 1926], p. 40.

<sup>4</sup> P. Villey, "Chronologie des œuvres de Marot," *Bulletin du Bibliophile* [1920], p. 208, n. 1.—P. Villey (*ibid.*, I, 207) remarque aussi qu'on "est tenté de se demander si [l'épître à Lyon Jamet] n'a pas été composée après coup, par une sorte de retour amusé que fit Marot sur son aventure."

ne dit avoir ordonné le procès de Marot qu'après avoir étudié son cas *Visis per nos informationibus et chargis [ . . ] factis [ . . ], audita etiam requesta et conclusionibus dicti promotoris,*<sup>5</sup> il semble que Marot n'ait pu être accusé de n'avoir pas observé, pendant le carême de 1526, les règles d'abstinence.

Mais, si, en 1526, on ne pouvait reprocher à Marot d'avoir mangé de la viande en Carême, les registres du Parlement montrent que, le 18 mars 1532, Marot et ses complices étaient "chargez d'avoir mengé de la chair durant le temps de karesme et autres iours prohibez." Le 20 mars 1532, on cessa les poursuites contre Marot. On voit qu'alors l'accusation contre Marot était précise, qu'elle était grave, car le poète avait fait gras publiquement, avec d'autres complices, par forfanterie, et avec une intention de scandale, et, pourtant, en 1532, au bout de deux jours, Etienne Clavier, "secrétaire des roy et royne de Navarre," se porta garant pour Marot le Poète était hors de cause.

Rapportons que le premier *coq-à-l'asne*, adressé à Lyon Jamet, a été daté de 1532 par Guiffrey (*op cit.*, I, 175) qui nous dit expressément qu'en rappelant le refrain de la *Ballade contre celle qui fut sa mye*, "Prenez le, il a mengé le lard," Marot fait allusion à la mésaventure de 1532 "et non à celle de 1526." Or, ce même *coq-à-l'asne* est daté par M. Villey du printemps de 1530 et M. Guy (*op cit*, p 148), d'après Becker, propose une autre date: "(automne 1526?)"

On voit l'incertitude de toutes les dates qui ont été proposées et qu'il est impossible de faire état de ces pièces pour déterminer l'accusation portée contre Marot en 1526. M. Guy (*op. cit.*, p. 187) nous dit qu'en 1532, "le Parlement réveilla soudain la procédure ouverte contre [Marot] en 1526", mais l'incrimination de 1532 est spécifique, celle de 1526 ne l'est pas, en 1532, pendant le Carême, on accuse Marot d'avoir mangé de la viande en Carême. En 1526, Marot se défend seulement contre ceux qui le soupçonnent de n'être pas catholique. M. Guy nous dit aussi "l'inculpé feint [en 1526] d'ignorer la chose dont on l'accuse, ne parle pas de banquet, ni de Carême, et pense acheter la clef des champs au prix, vaille que vaille, d'un acte de foi." C'est qu'en effet il s'agit, en 1526, d'une question de foi,<sup>6</sup> tandis qu'en 1532 ce n'est pas d'opinion.

<sup>5</sup> Cf Guiffrey, *op cit*, p 107

<sup>6</sup> Félix Frank a bien dit que Clément Marot fut "détenu en 1526 pour

ions religieuses qu'il s'agit directement, mais de pratique, comme le lui reprochera, plus tard, Sagon, qui dit à Marot

tu mengeois en Karesme du lard,  
Non pas cache, mais devant tout le monde

Mais l'emprisonnement de 1526 pose une autre question assez curieuse. "Par deux fois," (dans la *Ballade Contre celle qui fut sa mye* et dans le premier *Cog-à-l'asne*), d'après M. Guy (*op cit.*, p. 135), Marot "a avoué que, s'il avait tenu secrets les caprices de [sa] belle, il eût évité cette affaire, la prison, et un procès qui risquait de la mener loin." Ce serait à cause de la chanson *Ma dame ne m'a pas vendu* que Marot aurait été incarcéré. Or M. Villey ne peut situer cette chanson qu'avant 1527, sans plus de précision. En outre, M. Villey nous dit (*Marot et Rabelais* [Paris, 1923], p. 21) que Marot, "au moment où il fut jeté au Châtelet, vit dans cette affaire une vengeance de femme c'était Isabeau qui l'avait dénoncé aux docteurs de Sorbonne." Mais, pour P. Villey, ce serait le rondeau de l'*Inconstance d'Isabeau* dont la belle aurait voulu se venger. Guiffrey (*op cit.*, I, 78), nous parlant des amours de Marot, déclare

Marot venait en effet de former une liaison qui devait exercer sur le reste de son existence une influence funeste. Cette liaison eut pour résultat par la suite de le faire mettre en prison, et, comme autre conséquence, elle le poussa à déclarer la guerre aux docteurs de la Sorbonne et aux moines et à mettre un pied dans le parti protestant.

Femme fatale, vraiment! Citons enfin M. Plattard (*Marot* [Paris, 1938] p. 33): Marot fut "appréhendé, sur la dénonciation d'une femme, une certaine Ysabeau qu'il surnomma Luna (peut-être en raison de son caractère fantasque et lunaire)."

Relevons les textes. La *ballade contre celle qui fut sa mye* contient ces vers

Un jour rescrivis à m'amie  
Son inconstance seulement  
Mais elle ne fut endormie  
A me le rendre chauldement

Dans le premier *cog-à-l'asne* se lit le vers suivant.

*Ma dame ne m'a pas vendu,*

---

cause d'hérésie" (*L'Heptaméron de la reine Marguerite de Navarre*, édit. F. Frank [Paris, 1879], I, xxvi).

qui est l'incipit de la chanson que nous avons citée, écrite avant 1527.

Ainsi Marot nous déclare bien qu'il a été trahi par une femme, mais qui est cette femme, Marot ne nous le confie pas Ysabeau ? Luna ? Mais pourquoi identifier la dénonciatrice de Marot, et Ysabeau ? S'agit-il vraiment d'une maîtresse de Marot ? Le rondeau *De l'inconstance d'Ysabeau* n'est pas bien méchant, ni la chanson *Ma dame ne m'a pas vendu*. Il paraît excessif qu'une femme inconstante se venge de vers peu injurieux en allant en dénoncer l'auteur auprès de "M Bouchard, Docteur en Théologie," et en accusant Marot d'un crime que celui-ci semble ignorer. Et puis, jamais Marot, quand il raconte son internement au Châtelet, ne prononce le nom d'Ysabeau. Il ne parle de Luna que dans un poème, dans *l'Enfer*, car, s'il dit, dans le premier *coq-à-l'asne*, que

Toutes choses qui sont coiffées  
Ont moult de lunes en la teste,

ces vers ne prouvent pas que la dénonciatrice soit Ysabeau ni une autre femme (ou la même) nommée, à cause de ses goûts instables, Luna. M. Guy fait très justement observer (*op cit*, p 148) que "dans sa réponse (avril ou mai 1527 ?) [au premier *coq-à-l'asne*] Jamet prodigue les plaisanteries très poivrées [ . . . ]. Mais aux vers relatifs à Luna [ . . . ] nulle allusion n'est faite par l'ami Lyon. C'eût été, pourtant, le point essentiel." Si Jamet ne parle pas de Luna-Ysabeau c'est que, peut-être, Marot n'en parlait pas non plus.

Nous arrivons, enfin, au texte définitif. C'est à Chartres, où il fut transféré après avoir été emprisonné au Châtelet, que Marot composa *l'Enfer*. C'est donc là le texte qui, avec les épîtres à Bouchard et à Lyon Jamet, est le plus contemporain de l'événement. *L'Enfer* ne mentionne, nulle part, que Marot soit accusé d'avoir fait gras en Carême. Marot proteste de ses sentiments catholiques, il montre que son nom Clément

n'est point le nom de Lutheriste  
Ains est le nom (à bien l'interpréter)  
Du plus contraire ennemy de Luther

Marot nous dit aussi, dans *l'Enfer*, comme il fut

par l'instinct de Luna  
Mené au lieu plus mal sentant que soulfre,  
Par cinq ou six ministres de ce gouffre

Plus loin (v 324) il ajoute aux noms des personnes qui le connaissent celui de Luna. Celle-ci est mentionnée après *Jupiter* (François I<sup>er</sup>), *Pallas* (Marguerite d'Angoulême) et *Cybelle* (Louise de Savoie)

Quant à Luna, diverse et variable,  
Trop me cognoist son faulx cueu odieux

Est-ce que le mot *Luna*—à côté des termes allégoriques qui désignent le roi, sa sœur et sa mère,—ne semble pas, lui aussi, employé dans un sens métaphorique? <sup>7</sup> Et puis ce mot latin n'est-il pas curieux? Guiffrey (*op cit*, p. 110) nous rapporte que

les uns ont prétendu reconnaître sous un nom supposé, mais allégorique, la célèbre Diane de Poitiers [ ] d'autres ont voulu voir dans Ysabeau une incarnation de l'Eglise catholique, et dans le récit de cette aventure une fiction du poète pour raconter les tracasseries des papistes contre un adepte de la foi nouvelle

Guiffrey reproduit aussi la note de Dolet: "Marot prend Luna pour une femme inconstante et pleine de malice qui fut cause de son emprisonnement" Rappelons que, pour les Pères de l'Eglise, *luna* désigne bien l'Eglise, et la comparaison est faite à cause du caractère de mutabilité (*propter ipsam mutabilitatem*) qu'on reconnaît à la lune et à l'Eglise "*Ecclesia comparatur lunae quae in pace crescit, in persecutione minuitur*" (Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* [Parisus, 1879], CCXIX, 157), "*Ecclesia ut luna, modo prosperis clara, modo adversis obscura*" (*Ibid*, 233.) Ajoutons qu'en 1570, Pontus de Tyard fit graver un jeton dont une des faces représente la lune au dessus de la mer. On lit la devise: *Pontus me sequitur*. Jeandet <sup>8</sup> se demande si la lune n'est pas "une double allégorie sous le voile de laquelle, par une alliance du sacré et du profane [ . . . ] se cachent tout à la fois l'Eglise ou la Religion et Pasithée, la dame des pensées de Pontus." La mer suit la lune, comme Pontus suit l'Eglise et sa bien-aimée. Il est temps, maintenant, de conclure.

CONCLUSION. Les critiques ont dit que Marot fut dénoncé, en

<sup>7</sup> Pour Dreux du Radier, LUNA désignerait la Sorbonne, cf *Récollections historiques*, t. I, citées par l'auteur dans ses *Mémoires historiques, critiques, et anecdotes des reines et régentes de France* [Amsterdam, chez Michel Rey 1776], IV, 481, n. 2.

<sup>8</sup> J. P.-Abel Jeandet, *Pontus de Tyard* (Paris, 1860), p. 91

1526, "pour avoir mangé de la viande en carême"<sup>9</sup> A l'appui de cette accusation, les seuls documents qu'on invoque sont la *Ballade contre celle qui fut sa mye* et le premier *coq-à-l'asne* où Marot ne fait que jouer sur un dicton populaire *Prenez le, il a mengé le lard*, à une date qu'il n'est pas possible de déterminer avec précision C'est dans l'épître à Lyon Jamet qu'il est mention de lard et de *charr toute crue*, mais rien ne prouve qu'il y ait là une allusion à l'accusation portée contre Marot. On peut n'y voir qu'un détail pittoresque qui montre comment le rat a été attiré et comment il a été pris, de même que le lion fut, à son tour, pris au piège, un jour qu'il était sorti de sa caverne "pour chercher sa pasture" Si Marot a été inquiété et poursuivi pour n'avoir pas observé les règles d'abstinence pendant les jours maigres, ce n'est pas en 1526, mais en 1532, époque à laquelle des documents certains indiquent avec précision le grief fait à Marot Nous pensons qu'il était, en 1526, accusé d'hérésie et qu'il avait été emprisonné par l'autorité civile à l'instigation de l'Eglise Luna désignerait ainsi l'Eglise Catholique<sup>10</sup> et non pas une femme à laquelle Marot aurait reproché son infidélité et son inconstance et qui se serait vengée de son ancien ami Les pièces où Marot déclare que sa belle a un *cœur muable*, *qu'elle est faulxe et lasche de cœur* sont plutôt malicieuses que méchantes, et l'on ne voit pas qu'il y ait là cause à des représailles bien cruelles Nous ne trouvons aucune raison d'identifier Luna et Ysabeau ou Luna et Diane Il nous semble très fantaisiste d'imaginer que Marot éprouva pour Ysabeau une passion malheureuse et fatale qui poussa l'homme et la femme qui en furent l'objet à s'entredéchirer. Le caractère de Marot ne nous paraît pas celui d'un grand amoureux Nous voyons en lui un homme un peu sensuel, peut-être, mais, en somme, plus tourné vers la vie douce que vers les orages de la passion<sup>11</sup> Nous nous refusons à le trouver victime d'une trahison féminine, mais nous pensons, au contraire, que ses

<sup>9</sup> Villey, *op. cit.*, p. 21

<sup>10</sup> Les "choses qui sont coiffées" seraient, pour nous, les moines et les prêtres catholiques qui portent "bonnetz carrez ou rondz, ou chapperons fourrez d'ermes," ou ceux qui cherchent à cacher leurs oreilles d'âne sous leurs chapeaux (Cf *Les Marguerites de la Marguerite des Princesses*, édit F Frank [Paris, 1873], p. 290) Marguerite d'Angoulême fait souvent mention du Soleil, qui semble un emblème du Dieu de la religion évangélique

<sup>11</sup> Cf les remarques de P Villey (*op. cit.*, p. 24) sur l'amour de Marot pour Anne.



attaques contre la Sorbonne, contre l'Eglise, contre les moines, n'étaient pas le résultat d'un simple accident Marot, comme Erasme, comme Dolet, comme tous les esprits libres de son temps, a des raisons profondes d'en avoir à l'Eglise Catholique. Mais Marot avait intérêt, lui-même, à cacher les accusations que faisait contre lui *je ne sçay quel papelard*, il pouvait chercher à faire croire qu'il avait été l'objet de la vengeance d'une femme, qu'on l'avait mis en prison pour un crime dont on ne pouvait que rire, même si le cas avait quelque chose de sérieux

Si notre explication est acceptée, il en ressort qu'il faut réviser l'interprétation de quelques pièces de Marot, que la date de certains poèmes est fausse, que la personnalité de Marot est un peu différente de celle qui est traditionnellement acceptée

MARCEL FRANÇON

Harvard University

#### COUNTER-NOTES ON JEAN RENART

In his recent "Notes sur Jean Renart"<sup>1</sup> Mr. L. A. Vigneras returns to the charge in support of his dating of the *Escoufle*,<sup>2</sup> a dating rejected by Mme Lejeune<sup>3</sup> and myself<sup>4</sup> on what I believe I may be pardoned for calling compelling grounds. Apart from the crucial question of whether vss. 22-23 of the *Lai de l'Ombre* actually do constitute, as has been generally supposed, an allusion to the *Escoufle*, Mr. V.'s fresh argument is based upon purely subjective judgment<sup>5</sup> and is, hence, at best inconclusive. In any event, his entire case rests upon whether or not the *Escoufle* is alluded to

<sup>1</sup> *MLN*, LIV (1939), 262-66

<sup>2</sup> *MP*, XXX (1933), 241-56

<sup>3</sup> R. Lejeune Dehousse, *l'Œuvre de Jean Renart* (Paris and Liège, 1935), pp. 213 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *MP*, XXXII (1935), 343-52

<sup>5</sup> He believes the *Escoufle* lacks the youthful qualities of Renart's other works and gives evidence of a decline in the poet's literary powers. Mme Lejeune, however, characterizes the *Escoufle* (*op cit*, p. 393) as "cette œuvre de début à l'esprit juvénile." It is wholly obvious that judgments of this nature are lacking in reliability. If we were to apply such criteria to the dating of Cervantes' works, for instance, should we not be inclined to place the second part of *Quixote* before the first, the *Novelas* before *Galatea*? <sup>10</sup>

in the *Lai*, for, if it is, all arguments tending to place its composition after that of the *Lai* must of necessity crumble.

In vss 9073-74 of the *Escoufle* Renart seems to distinguish carefully between his own poem and the tale which served as its source by applying the term *roman* to the former and *conte* to the latter. Now, in the *Lai* he says

22 Par Guillaume qui depieça  
L'escoufle et art un a un membre,  
Si com li CONTES nous remembre .

Why, asks Mr V, does he use here the word *conte* and not *roman* if he is referring to his own romance? The query is not new; Warren voiced it in these columns thirty years ago,<sup>6</sup> but prudently refrained from drawing any conclusions. Mr V. is less reticent: the fact that Renart uses *conte* and not *roman*, he affirms, is evidence that the poet was referring not to his own work but to the tale which he was to utilize some twenty years later as its source. To see whether or not this conclusion is justified, let us turn a moment to the introductory verses of *Guillaume de Dole*. The poem begins

Cil qui mist cest conte en romans

A few verses farther we find the poet making essentially the same distinction between *conte* and *roman* as in vss 9073-74 of the *Escoufle*

26 S'est avis a chascun et samble  
Que cil qui a fet le roman  
Qu'il trovast les moz des chans,  
Si aferent a ceuls del conte

Nevertheless, to mark his entry into his matter proper, he says:

30 Si commence ici SON CONTE

Despite the distinction he sometimes maintains between *roman* and *conte*, Jean Renart did, then, on occasion use the latter term with reference to his own work.

The fact is that Vigneras and Warren have made the mistake of assuming that Renart used the two words in their modern acceptations. In the Old French period, *roman* denoted a work in the vernacular. *Conte* was used of any narrative regardless of length, it is, in fact, the term by which the medieval romances were

<sup>6</sup> *MLN*, xxiii (1908), 72-73

ordinarily designated. Thus, Chrétien's *Perceval* was known as *li Contes del Graal*. Jakemes, Author of the *Roman du castelain de Couci*, calls his romance a *conte* (vs. 57), as does Geibert de Montieuil his *Violete* (vss. 36, 47, 6635), Beaumanoir his *Manekine* (vss. 25, 29, 41), and Renaut his *Galeran de Bretagne* (vs. 7799). *Roman* and *conte* could, consequently, be used interchangeably of works in the vernacular, *conte* could be used as well of narratives in a tongue other than French—Latin or Breton, for instance. It became a literary tradition for romancers to mention the *conte* or *estoire* which they were putting into *roman*, that is, the vernacular, and then to refer to their work as *le roman*, i. e., *le conte en roman*, to distinguish it from the original *conte*. All of the writers mentioned above do just this thing, but, as we have seen, are not thereby prevented from terming their romances *contes* when there is no particular need to maintain the distinction.

It is now amply evident, I believe, that Renart's use of *conte* in the *Lai* to refer to the *Escoufle* is in no wise unusual and certainly it offers no basis for the assumption that Renart was not referring to his own romance. In any case, the passage of the *Lai* in question presupposes familiarity on the part of Renart's public with the thing alluded to. Otherwise the allusion would be lost. Now, in the *Escoufle* the poet tells us that the *conte* upon which he has based his romance is an old and forgotten one, known to few persons besides himself.

40                   Ne desque la ou bise souffle  
                       Ne curt qu'il ait mie .x. homes  
                       Ki sacent de cui nos disommes,  
                       Tant a esté lonc tans celés  
                       Li contes qui est revelés  
                       Par moi et mis en escriture

There can be no doubt, then, that the reference in the *Lai* is to Renart's own work, not to the obscure and unknown *conte*, which, moreover, was doubtless in a foreign tongue.

II. While on this subject, it may not be amiss to expose briefly the grounds on which I believe Mr. V.'s dating of *Guillaume de Dole*<sup>7</sup> likewise must be rejected. This dating rests upon the supposition that prior to writing the romance Renart was already under the protection of Milon de Nanteuil and had accompanied the

<sup>7</sup> *R.R.*, xxviii (1937), 109-21

latter on a journey to Aix-la-Chapelle in 1227. Now the fact of the matter is that we do not know for certain that Miles ever was Renart's protector, but, if he was, it was after the composition of *Gillaume de Dole* that he became so. The character of Renart's dedication of the romance to him is sufficient warrant for this

Cil qui mist cest contes en romains  
 Veut que ses pris et ses renons  
 Voist en Rancien, en Champaigne,  
 Et que li biaux Miles l'apregne  
 De Nantuel, uns des pieus del regne

As Mme Lejeune has gone to some pains to point out,<sup>8</sup> these verses are not the traditional dedication of the medieval romancer to a patron. It is obvious that Renart is addressing himself—here as in the dedication of the *Escoufle* to the count of Hainaut (vss 9058-71)—to a person to whom he is unknown. He wishes his worth and renown, or the worth and renown of his work—the reference of the possessives in vs 4 is ambiguous—to travel to Rheims and come to the attention of Milon. Taking even the interpretation most favorable to Mr V's stand—that is, assuming that *ses pris et ses renons* means the romance's worth and renown, not the poet's—can we suppose that Renart would have expressed himself thus if he had been in close contact with Milon, a member of Milon's household, his former travelling companion? Notice that Renart is not even presuming that Miles will read his romance; he is merely hoping good reports of it will reach "Rancien" so that Miles may learn of it. Once more then, he is very obviously not addressing himself to a patron, but rather making a bid for patronage.

The dedication contains another indication damaging to Mr V's dating. Renart wishes "ses pris et ses renons" to go to Milon "en Rancien." The passage must, consequently, have been written at a time when Miles was still in residence at Rheims, that is, not later than 1218. This point was established by Mme Lejeune,<sup>9</sup> but Mr. V has attempted to circumvent it.<sup>10</sup> Mme Lejeune, he says, is supposing that after his installation in the see of Beauvais Miles never again set foot in Rheims, whereas actually he must have had more than one occasion to return there and it is definitely known that he was there in 1228. That Miles did visit

<sup>8</sup> *Op cit*, pp 74-77

<sup>9</sup> *Op cit*, pp 81-82

<sup>10</sup> *RR*, xxviii, 110

Rheims after having assumed his episcopacy is, of course, evident—so evident, in fact, that I cannot believe Mme Lejeune ever thought otherwise. The point is, however, that the character of the passage in question is such that a temporary sojourn in Rheims will not suffice to explain it. Renart does not say he is sending his work itself to Milon, he merely wishes that it may become favorably known at Rheims so Miles will learn of it. This indicates not only that Miles was at the time in Rheims, but also that the poet expected him to remain there indefinitely. With Mr V's dating of the poem rejected, we must fall back upon that of Mme Lejeune, who with painstaking and sound scholarship seems to have attained as much precision and trustworthiness as is possible in this matter.

III In 1933 Mr. V, having discovered a clerk Piaudoue named in documents dating from the second half of the thirteenth century, concluded,<sup>11</sup> first, that this Piaudoue was one with the Piaudoue who figures in the tenson *De Renart et de Piaudoue*<sup>12</sup> and, second, that the tenson itself, together with its companion piece, *le Plant Renart de Dammartin contre Vairon, son roncain*,<sup>13</sup> was written in the neighborhood of 1260. Mme Lejeune has accepted implicitly the first conclusion,<sup>14</sup> I have done so with reservations.<sup>15</sup> Both Mme Lejeune and I, however, have rejected 1260 as the date of the two tensons. She believes they were written between 1235 and 1250,<sup>16</sup> I believe they were written still earlier.

Now Mr V. has found a fresh trace of his Piaudoue, which he considers justification for assigning to the two poems an even later date than the one he first proposed.<sup>17</sup> He has discovered that Piaudoue relinquished his parish of Vernonnet in 1267 and believes the reason for this action was that the clerk was forced thereto because of misconduct of the same nature as that with which Renart taxes him in the tenson. A passage in the tenson, which Mme Lejeune interprets as indicating that Piaudoue was not yet invested with priesthood, Mr V feels indicates rather that the clerk had been shorn of this dignity. Hence the two tensons must have been written after 1267.

In regard to the passage of *De Renart et de Piaudoue* just men-

<sup>11</sup> *MP*, xxx, 257-61

<sup>12</sup> *Ed R Lejeune, op cit*, pp 411-23

<sup>13</sup> *Ed R Lejeune, op cit*, pp 407-10

<sup>14</sup> *Op cit*, p 391

<sup>15</sup> *MP*, xxxii, 349-50

<sup>16</sup> *Op cit*, p 392-96

<sup>17</sup> *MLN*, lrv, 265-66

tioned (xxvii, 1-3), let us first remark that the conclusions of neither Mme Lejeune nor Mr. V are justified. It is impossible to say with any degree of certainty whether the verses were addressed to one aspiring to priesthood, to one invested with it, or to one fallen from that state. Let us say further that linguistic considerations seem to rule out the dates proposed by Mr. V. Not only does Renart's own language seem to indicate that his life did not extend very far into the thirteenth century,<sup>18</sup> but one of the tensons itself shows the etymological forms of the possessives *tuens* and *suens* in rime with *buens* and *cuens*.<sup>19</sup> Since the analogical forms had triumphed in the regions north of the Ile de France by 1250, it can hardly be supposed that the tensons, which show certain Picard characteristics,<sup>20</sup> were written after that date, especially in view of the fact that the writer—unless Mme Lejeune is correct in supposing this to have been Renart himself<sup>21</sup>—was apparently a young man.

Mme Lejeune has fixed 1235 as a *terminus a quo*<sup>22</sup> for the two poems on the ground that a man as old as Renart is represented in them to be could not have composed the *Lai de l'Ombre*, which she agrees with Mr. V was written in the neighborhood of 1220. The notion that the age of writers necessarily reflects itself in their work is, of course, entirely without foundation. One might cite any number—among them Milton, Voltaire, Goethe, Hugo—who produced their best works in their declining years.

I think we may get somewhere nearer the true date of our two poems by considering vss. 51-60 of the *Plant*. Vairon taunts Renart

52

or sont li doneor et mort et recreu

Mme Lejeune believes this is an allusion to Milon de Nanteuil.<sup>23</sup> It is to be remarked, however, that *doneor* is plural; the author of the tenson, then, was alluding to more than one of Renart's benefactors. There is to be noted too the term *recreu*. This may have been applied to Milon, but might much more aptly have been used of another person believed to have accorded favor to Renart, that is, his fellow townsman, Renaud de Dammartin, the vanquished hero of

<sup>18</sup> Cf *MP*, xxxii, 350-51

<sup>19</sup> *Le Plant Renart contre Vairon*, vss 57-60. Mme Lejeune has not noted this trait in her study of the language of the two poems.

<sup>20</sup> Cf Lejeune, *op cit*, p. 399

<sup>22</sup> *Op cit*, p. 393

<sup>21</sup> *Op cit*, 403-6

<sup>23</sup> *Op cit*, p. 393

Bouvines<sup>24</sup> Still another who we have reason to think was particularly generous to our poet is Renaud's kinsman Thibaut de Bar,<sup>25</sup> to whom Renart may very well have been presented by Renaud. Thibaut could hardly have been called *recreu*, but then we need not suppose that both epithets, that is, *mort* and *recreu*, applied to each of the two or more "givers" the author of the *Plant* had in mind. By the same token, if we are correct in thinking that Renaud was one of the givers alluded to, we need not suppose that he was already dead.

So far, of course, we are treading on very unfirm ground, but let us see what Renart replies to his nag. He indignantly gives him the lie and boasts of bounty from the king of France (vss. 53-56). This, although the fact seems not yet to have been recognized, is obviously ironical. The author of the *tenson* is thrusting at Renart a gibe whose sting must lie in the fact that Renart can expect no favor from the king—doubtless because he has been under the protection of the king's enemies. Hence Varon's surprise

57

Vous done dont li rois?

Renart goes on to name other benefactors (vss. 57-60), and the irony continues, for these are manifestly not true protectors but persons whose favor Renart had unsuccessfully solicited. Not one of them is mentioned in the other *tenson*, there, on the contrary, Renart is represented as being completely dependent for his existence upon a certain Bouteiller (xxviii, 4-12).<sup>26</sup>

The things we have just considered point to the period just following Bouvines as that in which our two *tensons* were composed. It must be admitted, however, that so far we have adduced nothing in itself very conclusive. Fortunately Renart himself comes to our aid in the opening verses of the *Lai de l'Ombre*. Mme Lejeune has recognized that the poet here alludes to his own situation and she sums up that situation.<sup>27</sup>

Qu'est-ce à dire, sinon que Jean Renart commente ici son cas personnel d'homme un peu déchu, ayant perdu un protecteur, démun d'argent, mais qui a foi en sa chance et en sa courtoisie, et qui se défend devant des concurrents, affirmant que lorsqu'on abandonne sa "folie," on peut retrouver sa situation primitive

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Lejeune, *op cit*, pp. 102-5<sup>26</sup> Cf. Lejeune, *op cit*, p. 394-95<sup>25</sup> Cf. Lejeune, *op cit*, pp. 110-11<sup>27</sup> *Op cit*, pp. 252-53

Now is this not precisely the picture of Renart given us by the *tensons*? The latter must, then, have been composed just before the *Lai* or at about the same time

But this is not all Renart seems to allude in the *Lai* to the *tensons* themselves At any rate he indicates that he has been an object of attack and reprimands his detractors

4                   Je ne vueil pas resambler ceus  
                   Qui sont garçon por tout destruire,  
                   Quar, puis que j'ai le sens d'estruire  
                   Aucun bien en dit ou en fet,  
                   Vilains est qui ses gas en fet,  
                   Se ma cortoisie s'aoevre  
                   A fere aucune plesant oeuvre  
                   Ou il n'ait ramposne ne lait  
                   Fols est qui por parole lait  
                   Bien a dire, por qu'il le sache,  
                   Et s'aucuns fel sa langue en sache  
                   Par derriere, tout ce li doit

While I feel that the precise dates assigned to the *Lai* by Mr V.<sup>28</sup> and Mme Lejeune<sup>29</sup> are subject to caution, there can be little doubt that the composition of the poem fell somewhere between 1217 and 1222. Thus, proceeding by another route, we again find our *tensons* falling into the period following Bouvines.

Renart's career may now be pieced out something like this: At the close of the twelfth century, already no longer young, he makes a bid for the protection of Baldwin of Flanders by dedicating to him the *Escoufle*. In this, however, he is either unsuccessful or the benefits derived therefrom are short-lived because of Baldwin's departure for the Crusades. Then Renart seems to have gained the protection of Renaud de Dammartin and in all probability accompanied the latter to the court of his cousin, Thibaut de Bar, who seems likewise to have shown the poet favor. Meanwhile Renart attempts to win the good will of the rising young churchman, Milon de Nanteuil, by dedicating to him *Guillaume de Dole*. Apparently the maneuver is unsuccessful. The death of Thibaut and the defeat of Renaud at Bouvines leave Renart without influential friends. His former connection with Renaud makes it difficult for him to find new protectors. He has been extravagant and now finds himself in want. Envious rivals taunt him with his

<sup>28</sup> *MP*, xxx (1933), 351-59

<sup>29</sup> *Op cit*, pp 246-57



age and misfortune With the *Lai de l'Ombre*, he makes a fresh attempt to win the patronage of Milon, recently named to the see of Beauvais In the meantime he seems to have gained the support of one of the royal butlers of Senlis, doubtless Gui IV

V. FREDERIC KOENIG

*The University of Arizona*

---

### RASSISCH-NATIONALE STILKUNDE

Der fremdlandische und der seiner Heimat entfremdete, deutsche Forscher, sie sind allzuleicht geneigt, über halb- oder pseudowissenschaftliche Leistungen des heutigen Deutschland einfach zur Tagesordnung überzugehen Damit werden aber zwei Geistesdialekte in ihrer unüberbrückbaren Differenz anerkannt und belassen So sei es dem Stilforscher gestattet, eine neuere Stiluntersuchung *kritisch* zu beleuchten Der Aufsatz, betitelt "Nationale Sinnbilder und lyrische Sprachgestaltung," von Edgar Glasser, steht in der "Neuphilologischen Monatsschrift" (Leipzig, Dez. 1937) Er stellt zwei Gedichte, Vigny's "Le cor" und Wildenbruch's "Siegfrieds Blut," als nationale Ausprägungen lyrischer Gestaltung einander gegenüber Als rassische Gemeinsamkeit wird eine gemeinsame überpersonliche "nordische" Symbolik herausgearbeitet, die einer "platonisch-plotinischen" Logosmystik entstamme das Horn als Sinnbild des ewigen Vermachtnisses heldischen Opfergeistes an Roncevaux schicksalhaft gekettet bei Vigny, die Wolke des ungesühnten Siegfriedblutes über dem Odenwald schwebend bei Wildenbruch Der nationale *Unterschied* zwischen den beiden lyrischen Haltungen beruhe in der humanistisch-universalistischen Verherrlichung des Heldentums *an sich* durch den Franzosen, der patriotisch-nationalen des deutschen Helden durch den Deutschen, wobei dann des letzteren Symbolik "enger, umgrenzter — kunstmassig gesehen —" sei Ein letzter Abschnitt bei Glasser bemangelt nicht mehr nur mit stil-, sondern mit politisch-kritischen Argumenten die "hohenzollerndeutsche" unvolkhafte Form dieses Wildenbruchschen Patriotismus, in dem Siegfried-Deutschland als "Riese von Leib, aber von Kopf und Herzen ein Kind" erscheint, das Tücke und Neid erliegt. Schon die blosse Inhaltsangabe wird die Bruchigkeit und innere Wider-

spruchlichkeit dieses Aufsatzes klargemacht haben. Sollen nationale Stilprägungen festgestellt werden, ist nur Gleichwertiges zu vergleichen, eine Vergleichung eines französischen vollkommenen Kunstwerkes mit einem missglückten, obskuren deutschen Machwerk (das Verfasser abdrucken musste weil es "nicht in dem gleichen Masse zugänglich sei") konnte doch offenbar nur missgunstige Folgerungen über deutsche Dichtung hervorrufen. Glasser, der diesen Barendienst deutscher Dichtung leistet, muss selbst "einen gewissen künstlerischen Gradunterschied" wenigstens in der Wirkung der Symbolik beider Gedichte zugestehen: der Hornruf Rolands ist ein wirklich historisch-legendarisch beglaubigter Anruf des Helden an die—stummbleibende—Mitwelt gewesen, die Blutwolke über dem Odenwald ist eine wurzellose, willkürliche Erfindung des um Blutsühne besorgten, gegen den Geist des Verrats im deutschen Volk eifernden Preussendichters Rolands Hornruf haftet wirklich an Roncevaux, so dass der Dichter und sein Leser sie hören müssen, die Blutwolke hat ein findiger Theatermacher, die gangige Metapher "blutrote Wolke" szenisch materialisierend, über den Odenwald hingekleckst. Die Kunst Vigny's in den vielbewunderten sieben Eingangsstrophen besteht in dem allmählichen Singenmachen der lokalen Erinnerungen, in dem Neuerwecken des ewigen Rolandrufes, in der Überführung der persönlich-traumerischen Dichter-Meditation in epische Herausbeschwörung des "ungetrostenen Schattens" des gescheiterten Helden. Über die Beschaffenheit der lyrischen Zauberkraft Willdenbruchs gibt gleich seine 1. Strophe Auskunft

Wenn Du *nun* kommst an den Odenwald  
Eine Wolke *da* wirst du sehen,  
Die wird regungslos und wie rotes Blut  
Über den Bergen stehen.

Die verräterisch gedankenlosen, holperigen und unpoetischen "*nun*" und "*da*" beweisen schon die missglückte Incantatio statt die Blutwolke an uns heranzuzaubern, wird sie vor uns gewaltsam wie ein Theaterrequisit aufgepflanzt. Durch das "*nun*" stolpern wir unvermittelt in medias res, das "*da*" fesselt den Blick vorzeitig an Unglaubliches. Sprachliche Ungeschicklichkeit verrät stets mangelnde Ergriffenheit des Dichters fast ist es schauerlich, bei diesem deutschumelnden Dichter—einen jüdelnden Tonfall zu entdecken! Ich sehe voraus, dass Glasser mit dem in

echt-Nordischem wurzelnden Volksliedton auftrumpfen wird, der auch in der bankelsangerhaften 2 Strophe anklingt

Denn im Odenwald, *das* weist Du ja,  
Schlugen den Siegfried sie tot,  
Die rote Wolke, *das* ist sein Blut,  
Das noch heute zum Himmel loht—

aber, erinnere ich mich nicht dass gerade R Wagner es war, der dem Intellektuellen Heine seine volkstumelnde "Bankelsangerpoesie" vorwarf? Was gegen Heine recht ist, ist auch gegen Wildenbruch billig wo bleibt in dem Leierkastenton die nordische Mythosatmosphäre?

Aber der kunstlerischen Gravamina gegen die 11 Strophen des deutschen Gedichtes sind noch viel mehr der Symbolismus Vigny's schwingt schwer und traumerisch traurig in der Landschaft, der Dichter gibt keine Erklärung mit einem "id est," während Wildenbruch platt seine eigene Allegorese—im Grunde ist es das, nicht Symbolik—ausdeutet und dem Leser, vorwegnehmend, dreinredet "Die rote Wolke, *das* ist sein Blut" und später "Wolke von Siegfrieds, von Deutschlands Blut," mit arithmetischer Gleichsetzung Siegfried-Deutschland Ist solche Klugschwatzerei am Poesischen deutsch? Glasser, der unaufrichtige Kommentator,<sup>1</sup> muss das Unpoetische dieses Selbstgedeuteten seines 'Dichters' gemerkt haben wie soll man sonst erklären, dass er gerade die banal rechtenden, unlyrischen, unsymbolischen Strophen nicht abgedruckt hat (die Berufung auf das "dem Verständnis Notwendige" kann nicht ernst sein—kann man in einem wahrhaften Gedicht verständnisnotwendige und- unnötige Teile sondern?)? Ich setze sie her

<sup>1</sup> Glasser schreibt "Finden wir bei Vigny die Schallsymbolik verwendet, so wird sich uns entsprechend bei Wildenbruch die Lichtsymbolik offenbaren"—es sollte noch gesagt werden dass die Blutwolke bei diesem statisch-dumpf wie eine unveränderliche Theatersonne alten Stils "regungslos" stehen bleibt, dieselbe bleibt—während bei Vigny der Hornruf eine aussere und innere Entwicklung hat (ist nicht der deutsche Dichter sonst "Werdedichter," der romanische "Sensrealist"?), aber es ist auch nicht wahr, dass Vigny bloss Schalle, Wildenbruch Licht verwendet (die Konsequenzen für die Nationalstile zieht hier Glasser übrigens nicht)—denn Vigny hat, wie ich s. Z. in meinen "Romanischen Stil- und Literaturstudien" nachwies, Schall- und Lichtsymbolik zugleich (*sombre vallée—l'éclat les [les chevaux] blanchit—les feux mourants du jour—roche noire*, auch eine Flammenwolke, die den blutigen Tod der Paladine aufzeigt, fehlt nicht), mit Vorwiegen der ersteren

- 3 Denn Siegfried, das war der herrliche Held,  
Wie ihn Deutschland nun einmal gebär—  
Toiheit und Niedertracht brachten ihn um,  
Weil er ein Deutscher war
- 5 Toricht in Liebe verriet ihn darum  
Kriemhild, das deutsche Weib,  
Raufte ihr Haar, als zu spat es war,  
Über des Toten Leib
- 6 Schmahlich in Schwache verriet ihn darum  
Gunther der Königsman,   
Weil ihm das fremde Weib es befahl,  
Gab er den Deutschen daran
- 8 Denn was vor tausend Jahren geschah,  
Tut man in Deutschland *noch jetzt*,  
Dass man das treue Heldenblut  
Schmahlich hetzt
- 9 Heut noch über dem deutschen Land  
Waltet der Fremden Gebot,  
Seine Kinder bewerfen noch heut  
Die eigene Mutter mit Kot

Glasser sagt "Das Gedicht ist datiert Heidelberg, Johannistag 1904" d. h. dass das Gedicht von vornherein auf eine groteske historische Unwahrheit gegründet ist, ("Heut [1904'] noch über dem deutschen Land. ") und ferner, dass der Dichter nichts getan hat, um das Motiv des Johannisfeuers mit dem Gedichtmotiv innerlich zu verbinden. Seine innere Unergriffenheit zeigt sich darin, 1) dass der Dichter alles getan hat, um durch seine rhetorischen *heut noch, noch heut* jedes sanfte Übergehen von Erinnerung in Vision zu zerstören, 2) dass seine unaufhorlichen Kausalanknüpfungen (*weil, darum*) uns in eine ganz unlyrische Verstandes- und Ironiewelt hineinführen, eine polemisch-moralpädagogische These beweisen, dass nämlich Deutschsein Verraten heisst, im Gegensatz zu Vigny, der den Verrat nur als Möglichkeit andeutet ("Il [Karl der Grosse] crant la trahison").

Wir geraten in die politische Rugeschriftstellerei eines Heine oder Borne hinein, die Raunewelt des Mythos ist längst vertrieben. Vigny's Haltung ist nicht nur menschlich-vornehmer—weil sie nicht bestimmte Mächte der Schuld am Tod seines Helden anklagt—, sie ist nicht nur menscheitsbedacht, weil sie humanistisch-universalistisch ist, was in einer cartesianisch-helleien Wertwelt noch immer hoher steht als national-patriotisch,—sie ist auch poetisch rein, weil sie nicht Satire und Rugelied mit lyrischer Evocation epischen

Geschehens vermischt, weil sie ein tragisches Schicksal—den Tod des Helden in der Welt—nicht kurzfristig bestimmten Kräften zuschreibt, sondern sie als eine hohergesetzliche Notwendigkeit erscheinen lässt, die durch eine andere Gesetzlichkeit, die des erlosenden Nachruhs, übergriffen und verklart wird. Nicht bloss die geringe Volksverbundenheit des Hohenzollerndichters ist schuld an dem dichterischen Fehlschlag, sondern der Mangel an metaphysischer Fernsicht, die plump zugreifende Tappischkeit und Absichtlichkeit. Wie konnte an so untauglichem Objekt unternommen werden, ein deutsches "nationales Sinnbild" lyrischer Sprachgestaltung aufzuweisen? Glasser hat, rein methodisch gesprochen, sich, wie ältere positivistisch gesinnte Stilforscher, von dem Was der dichterischen Motivik (Hornruf-Blutwolke, beide an einem Orte haftend—diese Stoffübereinstimmung ist offenbar sein Ansatzpunkt gewesen) betören lassen, statt dem Wie nachzugehen. Eine lyrische Evokation episch-legendarischer Vorgänge ist mit einem legendär verbiamenten politischen Schimpflied inkommensurabel. wo findet man bei Vigny solch unlyrische, banal-ungeformte Wendungen wie "Torheit und Niedertracht brachten ihn um, weil er ein Deutscher war," "dass man das deutsche Heldenblut schimpflich zu Tode hetzt" "bewerfen noch heut die eigene Mutter mit Kot"??

Wenn Wildenbruch ein nationales Sinnbild lyrischer Sprachgestaltung sein soll, dann sind Unkunst, Drastik, unmetaphysische Schimpflust, engstirniger Nationalismus, intellektueller Mythologismus, falscher Volkston *deutsch*—quod non erat demonstrandum!<sup>2</sup>

Eine unfreiwillige Ironie hat es gefügt, dass Glasser als Parallele zu Wildenbruchs "Sehen" der Wolke über dem Odenwald das Sehen und Hören des "rhetorischen Politikers" Mussolini gesellt. "Ma dalle Alpi bianchi di neve e vermiglie di sangue il grido è stato udito"—jawohl, Wildenbruch ist ein rhetorischer Politiker, der die Fertigfabrikate der politischen Tribune mit dichterischem Bilden verwechselt!

Bei der Aufordnung des französischen Romantikers, die die Ras-

<sup>2</sup> überhaupt sollte der Stilforscher, der deutsche mit sonstiger Dichtung vergleicht, darauf achten, dass wir Deutsche an lyrische Poesie einen weniger strengen Massstab anlegen, als im allgemeinen Romanen und Engländer. R. Musil hat in seiner Rilke-Rede mit der zweitrangigen deutschen Lyrik mutig abgerechnet und zwischen Goethe und Rilke ein Vacuum festgestellt.

sengemeinschaft Vigny-Wildenbruch stützen soll, kann man sich nicht lange aufhalten wer in Vigny's melancholisch sanftem Hornruf ein "an germanischen Walhallmythus und Wodanskult gemahnendes Sinnbild des ewigen Vermachtnisses heldischen Opfergeistes" horen kann, der muss auch in Petrarca's "Africa" und in aller Rom- und Ruinenpoesie die Hufe des Wodansheeres vernehmen Und da doch der Gegenspielei des Nordischen offenbar der semitische Geist ist, so ware man begierig, die—nirgends versuchte—Abhebung von althebraischem Heldensang und Babylontrauer zu erleben An die Stelle überprüfbarer Beweise für aperçuhafte Typisierungen schiebt sich ein selbstverständlichtuendes "Bekanntlich"

Dass bei einer so grobschlachtigen national-differentiellen Stilistik das Ungleiche gleichmacherisch eingeebnet werden muss, ist vorauszusehen Da sollen z B die beiden Fragen

Âmes des Chevaliers, revenez-vous encore?  
Est ce vous qui parlez avec la voix du cor?  
Roncevaux! Roncevaux! dans ta sombre vallée  
L'ombre du grand Roland n'est donc pas consolée?

und

Wolke von Siegfrieds, von Deutschlands Blut,  
Die keine Sturme verwehen,  
Blutmal über dem Odenwald,  
Willst du niemals, niemals vergehen?

Gestaltungen "mit der rhetorisch-mahnenden kontemplativen Frage sein," bei denen "der Redende über die staunende Betrachtung einer Tatsache nicht hinausgeht" "Rhetorisch" ist offenbar die deutsche, "kontemplativ" die französische Stelle, nicht sind beide zusammen rhetorisch-kontemplativ (was ja eine Contradictio wäre) der französische Dichter spricht die Frage sanft betroffen zu sich selbst im Augenblicke da aus der Hornruf-Traumerei seine Vision entsteht, im Augenblick der Unsicherheit zwischen lyrischer Meditation und epischem Schauen, während der preussische Dichter mit der kopfschüttelnd-entrusteten Frage ein dynamisch-drastisches Gedicht ungeduldig (*nemals, niemals*) abschliesst Wie kann der Stilforscher so "grammatikalistisch" am Buchstaben, in diesem Fall an der Interpunktion (dem Fragezeichen) kleben?

Wenn die Todesweise Rolands wie die des Wolfs bei Vigny "eddisch"-stoisch ist, so sehe ich nicht ab, wie die griechisch-romische Stoa der Aufnordung entgegen kann.

Wenn vollends in der Racine-Stelle "Voyage infortuné! Rivage malheureux! Fallait-il approcher de tes bords dangeieux!" eine magisch-fatalistische "Schicksalsbindung an einen bestimmten Ort, der das Sinnbild der Wiedererinnerung darstellt,"<sup>3</sup> auch im Norden beheimatet sein soll und wenn dieser Fatalismus vom Jansenismus her stammt, wie Verfasser will, dann wird offenbar auch diese letztere Richtung, als französisches Analogon zu deutschem Protestantismus, "nordisch annektiert"

So scheint Nordisch ein allüberflutendes und allverschlingendes Sammelbecken zu werden, in dem Preziosität<sup>4</sup> wie der sie überwindende Klassizismus, Romantik wie Klassik ihre Wasser vermischen. Wenn die dynamisch sich wandelnde und vertiefende Symbolik Vigny's, dieses Bedeutungsverleihen an den Laut (Todesruf des Helden-Anruf der Welt) in irgend einem Kulturklima—ein Rassenklima lässt sich ja nicht ausfindig machen—beheimatet ist, so höchstens—wie auch die ähnliche Flauberts (man denke an das Brautbukett Emma Bovarys und den Zaimph Salammbôs), in dem des *Christentums*, das z. B. in der "Wandlung" belanglose Dinge mit höchster Wirkungskraft ausstatten kann. Die Blutwolke Wildenbruchs ist Theaternebel, keiner Transsubstantiation fähig—sie wird ewig "unerlost" über dem Odenwald hangen. Wenn es schon etwas wie "westlich-gallische Bravour" gibt, so hatte ich gedacht, dass Zeilen wie die folgenden, die an die Beredsamkeit des Corneille'schen "Cid" erinnern

Il (Roland) rugit comme un tigre et dit "Si je me rends,  
Africain, ce sera lorsque les Pyrénées  
Sur l'onde avec leurs corps rouleront entraînées"

oder. (der Maure sagt, indem er einen Stein auf Roland walzt) "Rends-toi donc, répond-il, ou meurs, car les voilà (sc. les Pyrénées)"—"Merci, cria Roland, tu m'as fait un chemin," der Kritik des Edda-Nordlings verfallen mussten. Aber nein—il y a des accommodements avec le ciel—de Walhalla

<sup>3</sup> Sind die romantischen Orte, die *Mort Homme*, *Ome morto* (Italien), *Homem morto* (Portugal) heissen und einen Mord an einem Menschen durch ihren Namen verewigen, auch nordisch?

<sup>4</sup> Glasser hat (*Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, 1934, Sp. 326) allen Ernstes die französische Preziosität des 17. Jahrhunderts als "späte, raum-zeit-gestaltlich abgewandelte Ausformung der Nordgesinnung" angesprochen, die sich in Gothik, Barock, Rococo, Romantik zeige. Fehlt nur das "dunkle Dichten" und die *gala scienza* der Provenzalen!

Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen dass Glasser, in bewährten stilistischen Methoden wohlbewandert, die verglichenen Objekte durch Herantragen so lockerer Kategorien wie "nordische Gesinnung" zurechtstutzt und die Methode der Vergleichung (mehr des motivischen Was als des künstlerischen Wie) so parteusch handhabt, dass der Eindruck der Vergleichbarkeit und künstlerischen Gleichwertigkeit entsteht Charles Dubos in seinem schonen Aufsatz "La notion de littérature et la beauté du langage" ("Approximations," VII) geht von dem Longinus-Wort aus "Die schonen Worte sind wahrhaftig das eigene und natuerliche Licht unserer Gedanken" und zeichnet das Streben der Gedanken zum "repos dans la lumière" "Toutes les fois où sur un texte se pose cette couronne de la beauté, l'on peut être certain que, quelle que soit la nature de son contenu, le texte appartient aux belles-lettres La littérature, c'est la pensée, accédant à la beauté dans la lumière. Mais, en même temps qu'elle le couronne de sa beauté, la présence de la lumière dans un texte est le signe que la pensée est vraiment née au jour son absence, l'indice qu'elle n'est pas toute dégagée des limbes de la gestation, et, en deçà d'être vraiment née au jour, pas davantage une pensée n'appartient aux belles lettres."

"Siegfrieds Blut" gehort, weder gedanklich noch sprachlich ausgereift, nicht in den Bereich der belles-lettres. Vigny's "Le cor" tragt an sich die sichtlichen Zeichen der dichterischen Begnadung die Lichtkrone des *schonen* wortgewordenen Gedankens

Stilvergleichung aber soll nur unternehmen eine lautere, dem Schonen sicher und sanft erschlossene Seele, die das Licht der dichterischen Gnade vom Dunkel des Chaotischen und Vorkunsterischen zu scheiden weiss Das Schone und die Kunde vom Schonen müssen "in sich selig" sein. Politisierte Stilkunde, garstige Kunde! <sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Hier mochte ich den durch politische Parteilichkeit skrupellos gewordenen Glasser festnageln, der behauptet, dass Friedrich Schurr das "Leitmotiv vom Hornklang" erkannt hat und die durchaus "unangemessene Auffassung eines Spitzer" durch die verdienstliche Feststellung beseitigt habe, "dass der Ton des Hornes nicht als unepischer Bericht über einen zweckhaften Hilferuf, sondern als lyrischer Ausdruck eines heldischen Sinngehaltes aufzufassen ist" Ich stelle fest, dass ich in "Romanische Stil- & Literaturstudien" II die Thematik des Gedichts, nach summarischen Andeutungen Roustan's und Fubini's, im Einzelnen nachgewiesen habe, was Schurr selbst ("Neuere Sprachen" 1933, S 251) zugibt Schurr betont mehr als ich die heldische Pflichterfullung des Ausharrens an verlorenem



Wenn National- und "Rassengefuhl" die *Liebe zur Dichtung* abzustumpfen imstande sind, so ist wirklich der höhere Wert dem niederen geopfert worden denn beim Nationalgefühl ist, neben dem Gefühl des Aufgehens des Einzelnen im Volksganzen, auch eine naive Selbstverherrlichung des primitiven Seins ("mein Volk ist gross, also auch ich") mitgegeben, während die Liebe zum Schönen nur den edelsten und selbstlosesten Teil des Einzelnen aufruft. Der Irrtum des Stilkritikers, der humanitar-universalistische Literaturwerte mit national-patriotischen auf *eine* Stufe stellt, beruht auf derselben Werte-Verwirrung wie der, die ihn nationale mit künstlerischen Werten verwechseln lässt. Grillparzers herbes Wort ("von Humanität durch Nationalität zu Bestialität"—Rassischkeit war damals noch nicht vorhersehbar) gestattet, Kunst und Afterkunst zu scheiden: eine inhumane Kunst und eine inhumane Kunstbetrachtung sind Widersprüche, die sich selbst aufheben.

LEO SPITZER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

### FAVRAS AND HUGO'S *MARIE TUDOR*

While it is more than probable that Hugo found some of the inspiration for *Marie Tudor*<sup>1</sup> in the *Christine* of Dumas père,<sup>2</sup> with its similar "triangle" of queen, favorite, and executioner,<sup>3</sup> he can have drawn on it only for the first *journée* and part of the second. The resemblance ceases at the point where the queen

Posten, ich hatte, im Hinblick auf die zweimalige Erwähnung des *appel*, des Hornrufs, das tragische Unterbleiben der Verständigung des Helden mit der Welt (das doch auch in dem epischen Teil dargestellt ist) hervorgehoben, Pflichterfüllung ist doch mit Heldentum gegeben! Nur boser Wille kann einen "zweckhaften Hilferuf" dem "Heldischen" gegenüberstellen. Schliesslich ist diesen neudeutschen, sehr irdisch zweckhaft vorgehenden ultraheroischen Ideologen, die 'out roland Roland' mochten, zu sagen, dass Roland, weniger heldisch als ihre Ideologie es will, doch tatsächlich um Hilfe *gerufen hat*.

"Dieu! que le son du cor est triste au fond des bois!"

<sup>1</sup> First performed Nov. 7, 1833, at the Porte Saint-Martin.

<sup>2</sup> First performed Feb. 25, 1830. See Edmond Biré, *Victor Hugo après 1830*, Paris, Perrin, 1891, I, 108 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Named as such by Hugo in the preface to *Marie Tudor*. Hugo, *Œuvres complètes*, Imprimerie Nationale, Théâtre, III, 1904, p. 7.

delivers her favorite to the executioner<sup>4</sup> From there on, *Marie Tudor* becomes the story of her vain attempt to save, especially by a trick of substitution, a man whose death is willed by the people

Not only is there nothing of the sort in *Christine*, but this second action of *Marie Tudor* is so opposite to that of the first part that with all due allowance for the generating power of antithesis in Hugo's imagination it is still difficult to find an adequate organic relationship, the second action can perhaps be explained as resulting from the first, but if there is a central idea governing the play as a whole it is unusually obscure<sup>5</sup> Indeed, Hugo seems to have been uncertain as to his own intention, for the manuscript of the play reveals that he reversed the original outcome, not under pressure from actors or public, but evidently as an almost immediate reconsideration.

If Hugo saw *Favras* presented at the Gaité in 1831,<sup>6</sup> this second plot-action is thoroughly accounted for, as well as the highly revolutionary tone of *Marie Stuart* and perhaps the character of the Queen He could not have failed to know of the play in the small theatrical world of the 1830's, he could have read it, everything in his interests and associations with the theater at this period would support the evidence of *Marie Tudor* that he saw it

*Favras, épisode de 1789*, in three acts, by MM Merville and T. Sauvage,<sup>7</sup> is basically historical, though with fictional complications

The marquis of Favras is accused of high treason, but is too loyal to his superiors to present the evidence that might save him The court, disposed to believe him innocent, is overawed by a mob which is incited by two unscrupulous plotters, Tucaut and Morel The actual leader of the mob, and the most striking figure of the play, is Théroigne de Méricourt, who is moved not only by her own instinctive sympathy with the people, but by her resentment that a noble might escape conviction while the man she loves, Marcel, is in prison. Under her influence, and fearing mob violence, the court sentences Favras to be hanged The marquise de Favras connives with several men for her husband's escape, Marcel, who does not wish to spend a life in prison separated from Théroigne, volunteers to die for him

<sup>4</sup> End of *Journée II*

<sup>5</sup> Cf discussion by A Vitu, *Les Mille et une nuits du théâtre*, Paris, Ollendorff, 1885, II, 198 ff Based on the performance of 1873

<sup>6</sup> First performed May 19

<sup>7</sup> Paris, *aux magasins de pièces de théâtre*, 1831 Imprimerie Chassaignon

When Théroigne brings him hope of eventual escape, he revolts against his sacrifice, but finally decides to keep his word, and leaves his money with the Marquise to be given to Théroigne after his death. At the last moment his heroic action is thwarted, and it is the Marquis who is executed, the failure of the plan being shown to the Marquise and to the audience by the reappearance of Marcel a moment after the execution.

Thus in *Favras*, as in *Marie Tudor*, a man is condemned by the official judgment of legal authority, but would go free if it were not for the threat of mob violence. In *Favras* the mob invades the stage,<sup>8</sup> while in *Marie Tudor* it remains offstage,<sup>9</sup> but in each play the scene of intimidation by the mob is given in full, and the sentence is read to the mob to pacify it. This sentence, in each play, states that the prisoner is to carry in his hand *une torche de cire jaune*,<sup>10</sup> a requirement of the Church, but one not often explicitly named on the stage. In both plays the execution is at night, a fact favoring the attempt to substitute another man. Hugo adds a black veil to cover the condemned man, there is nothing of the sort in *Favras*, but a man in black has a conspicuous part in the fatal procession.

There is no resemblance of character in the men condemned to die, and not a close one between their substitutes. Marcel volunteers to die for the marquis de Favras, Gilbert has no intention of dying for Fabiani but offers to give his life, for a price, in doing whatever the Queen commands. In thus offering their lives, Marcel is inspired partly and Gilbert wholly by despair at the loss of the woman each loves.

Marcel Grâce! une détention perpétuelle! Quelle grâce! J'aimerais autant j'aimerais mieux mourir. Languir des années, des siècles, dans leurs prisons. Deux années dans leurs cachots infects, les angoisses d'une procédure, d'un jugement séparé d'elle, de celle que j'aime. Pauvre Théroigne! (*F*, II, 2)

Gilbert Ma mort. Qu'entends-tu par ce mot? Ma mort, c'est que Jane ne m'aime plus. Du jour où je n'ai plus été aimé, j'ai été mort. Il y a une chose certaine, c'est que je voudrais mourir. (*M T*, III, 1, 1)

In each play there is one unsuccessful attempt to rescue the condemned man directly from prison.<sup>11</sup> It is in a night scene at the

<sup>8</sup> Act II, scenes 16-19

<sup>9</sup> *Journée* III, part 1, scene 9

<sup>10</sup> *Favras*, II, 19, *Marie Tudor*, III, 1, 9

<sup>11</sup> *Favras*, II, 9-10, *Marie Tudor*, III, 1, 7-8.

Châtelet, near the prisoners' cells, that Mme de Favras consults with the duc de Penthievre and an official as to the means of saving her husband, it is in a night scene at the Tower of London, near the cells, that Mary demands that Maître Énéas find a way to save Fabiani.<sup>12</sup> Though the sequence of events is different, there is in each play a scene where the man who has been willing to die threatens to upset all plans by a change of heart.

Marcel Madame . ma pauvre chère dame j'en suis bien fâché  
mais j'ai fait des réflexions .

Mme de Favras Grand dieu! vous refuseriez-vous maintenant?

Marcel Que voulez-vous? J'ai appris une chose qui change terriblement  
les affaires (F, III, 10)

Gilbert Je ne suis plus décidé à mourir, madame

La Reine Comment!

Gilbert Tenez, majesté, j'ai réfléchi toute la nuit Rien ne m'est prouvé  
dans cette affaire (M T, II, 3)

As the condition of Marcel's sacrifice, the marquise de Favras must not only give a considerable sum of money to Théroigne, but must promise to give all possible affection, advice, and protection to the woman she holds largely responsible for her husband's conviction. She is willing to give the money, hesitates to promise to love her enemy, and finally consents.<sup>13</sup> Queen Mary, asked to pay for the right to dispose of Gilbert's life, offers money freely but is overwhelmed on finding that the full condition, which she has sworn to fulfill, involves restoring Jane's rank and estates and marrying her to Fabiani.<sup>14</sup> Hugo has constructed a more paradoxical situation than that of *Favras*, but its basis is similar: the woman must aid her natural adversary to purchase the man's life. Marcel has also a second condition, which in *Marie Tudor* is reduced to a passing suggestion.

Marcel Le reste de la somme, vous le donnerez à ma vieille mère  
(Il pleure amèrement) J'ai encore ma mère, madame (F, III, 5)

La Reine Fais tes conditions Si tu as une vieille mère, et qu'il faille  
couvrir sa nappe de lingots d'or, parle, je le ferai (M T, II, 3)

Mary does not make her bargain with the same motive as the marquise de Favras, but her change of mind places her in a similar

<sup>12</sup> *Favras*, III, 1; *Marie Tudor*, III, 1, 10

<sup>13</sup> *Favras*, III, 5

<sup>14</sup> *Marie Tudor*, II, 34.

position, and when she determines to rescue Fabiani she can employ, like the Maiquise, a man who has agreed to die

The funeral procession, the principal spectacle of each play, now crosses the stage on its way to the place of execution<sup>15</sup> After its passing, a man—and in each play this man has been an original instigator of the mob—suspects something, voices his suspicions, and disappears to investigate

La Foule Le voilà! Le voilà!

Turcati Eh! non, ce n'est pas lui

Morel Je veux monter à l'Hôtel-de-Ville, pour savoir un peu ce qui se passe Il a peut-être trouvé encore quelque faute d'orthographe ou plutôt il y a quelque manigance Je vas voir ça (Il monte à l'Hôtel-de-Ville) (*F*, III, 12)

Simon Renard (après que le cortège a disparu) Qu'est-ce que cela signifie? Est-ce bien là Fabiani? Je le croyais moins grand Est-ce que maître Énéas? Il me semble que la reine l'a garde auprès d'elle un instant Voyons donc! (Il s'enfonce sous l'escalier, à la suite du cortège) (*M T*, III, 2, 1)

In both plays the attention of the audience at the moment of the execution is fixed on the two women who await the result The scene between them in *Favras* is brief and that in *Marie Tudor* is extended, yet the latter scene is largely a working out of the dramatic values inherent in the former In *Favras* Théroigne has no idea that the substitution is to be attempted, whereas the Marquise is confident that it has now succeeded Jane and the Queen are in exactly the same relationship to one another at the beginning of the last scene of *Marie Tudor*, but Hugo enlarges the scene until their mutual revelations and the interplay of their emotions have created doubt in the minds of both as to the outcome In *Favras* the audience is in suspense, but each woman is sure, in *Marie Tudor* the women intensify the suspense of the audience by sharing its doubts Despite artistic gains, Hugo has lost some of the ironic value of the situation, for the misplaced pity of Mme de Favras for Théroigne is keenly, if briefly, dramatic.

The result of the execution is announced to the audience by the reappearance, in *Favras* as in *Marie Tudor*, of the man who has prevented the substitution He accompanies the man he has saved and takes credit, not for saving him, but for the death of the man condemned Here are the final scenes of the two plays.

<sup>15</sup> *Favras*, III, 11, *Marie Tudor*, III, 2, 1

Théroigne (qui se détourne de l'exécution, se trouve en face de la marquise) Comment c'est vous? vous ici?

Mme de Favras (lui donnant le portefeuille) Tenez, prenez ceci c'est Marcel qui vous le donne Et songez que vous avez en moi une amie qui toujours

Marcel (traversant la foule accompagné de Morel et d'un cavalier) Ne prends pas! C'est le prix d'un marché qui n'a pas eu lieu

Morel Grâce à moi

Mme de Favras C'est vous! vous!!! Et là? là? qui donc (Elle aperçoit son mari) Ah!!! (Elle tombe évanouie) (F, III, 15)

La Reine Il n'y en a plus qu'un de vivant Dans un instant nous saurons lequel Mon Dieu, celui qui va entrer, faites que ce soit Fabiano!

Jane Mon Dieu, faites que ce soit Gilbert! (Le rideau du fond s'ouvre, Simon Renard paraît, tenant Gilbert par la main) Gilbert! (Ils se précipitent dans les bras l'un de l'autre)

La Reine Et Fabiano?

Simon Renard Mort

La Reine Mort? Mort! Qui a osé?

Simon Renard Moi J'ai sauvé la reine et l'Angleterre (M T, III, 2, 2)

What is convincing is no one resemblance between the plays, but the total number and the fact that while parts of the plot of *Favras* do not reappear in *Marie Tudor*, nearly all the important elements of the latter part of *Marie Tudor* have prototypes of some sort in *Favras*. It is no exaggeration to say that Dumas' *Christine* plus *Favras* will account for so much of the plot of *Marie Tudor* that Hugo's contribution is less one of invention than of fusion, rearrangement, transference into another setting and expression in a richer style. The French Revolution had to become Mary's England, but *Marie Tudor* is still full of the atmosphere of the Revolution. The Place de Grève and the Châtelet had to become Tyburn and the Tower of London, but as Joshua remarks to Fabiano "A Paris, Tyburn s'appelle la place de Grève"<sup>16</sup>. The condemned man was transformed from the marquis de Favras to Fabiano Fabiani, favori de la reine, a linguistic expansion as typical of Hugo as it would be surprising in another writer. Marcel, man of the people, became romanticized into Gilbert le ciseleur, but remained the devoted lover of a younger and less responsible woman. *Christine* and *Favras* were perhaps fused in the scene where Mary offers the executioner her lover's head,<sup>17</sup> in *Christine* the Queen

<sup>16</sup> From an *acte inédit* Hugo, *op. cit.*, p. 116

<sup>17</sup> *Marie Tudor*, II, 9

delivers her favorite to the executioner, but it is in *Favras* that the official executioner appears prominently on the stage and takes the Marquis away to his doom<sup>18</sup>

Yet Hugo made one most important alteration of rôle. So far as the action is concerned, Mary corresponds to the marquise de Favras, but the character, emotions, and acting values of her part are utterly different. No doubt Hugo owes something to history in his conception of the Queen, perhaps also something to Dumas, and certainly something to his own imagination. More than any of these, his Mary is a royal incarnation of Théroigne de Méricourt, instable, emotional, alternating sentimentality with callousness, imperious, jealous. In *Favras* she is shown helpless at one moment, commanding at another, an object of alternate pity and fear to Mme de Favras. Mary has bothered even friendly critics of Hugo's plays, Vitu put his finger on the spot with remarkable exactness: "*Ce n'est pas une reine, c'est une harengère*"<sup>19</sup>

The fact that Hugo had thought of Théroigne in writing the rôle of Mary, whereas Mme de Favras occupied the position he gave Mary with relation to the plot, probably accounts for his confusion in writing the conclusion to the play<sup>20</sup>. The first version gives the *tableau* which corresponds to that of *Favras*. Mary-Théroigne is victorious as the man she loves reappears, while Jane falls unconscious, like Mme de Favras, on realizing that the man she loves has died. But this is the reverse of the plot-outcome of *Favras*, where the attempted substitution fails, thwarted by Morel's suspicions. On reconsideration, Hugo preferred to follow the plot which had inspired so much of his play. Certainly he had no predilection for the happy ending, nor did his audience at the Porte-Saint-Martin, but he may have thought this outcome more logical, and in any event it enabled him to expand Morel's "*Grâce à moi*" into the striking last line of *Marie Tudor*.

GIRDLER B. FITCH

*The Citadel, Charleston*

---

<sup>18</sup> Act III, scene 11

<sup>19</sup> *Op. cit.*, II, 213

<sup>20</sup> Paul et Victor Glachant, *Essai critique sur le théâtre de Victor Hugo. Les Drame en prose*, Paris, Hachette, 1903, pp. 129-30

# THE DATES OF DIDEROT'S BIRTH AND DEATH

Too many biographers of Diderot, even including M André Billy in his recent and in general excellent work (1932), have adopted the unfortunate practice of not citing authorities. In cases of disagreement or any degree of uncertainty, it is therefore impossible, without further research, to be sure what are the facts. This is true even in the matter of the exact dates of Diderot's birth and death.

Although most biographers of Diderot agree that he was born "le 5 octobre 1713,"<sup>1</sup> Luppel carelessly says "le 1<sup>er</sup> octobre."<sup>2</sup> Diderot's daughter, Mme de Vandeul, puts his birth merely "au mois d'octobre"<sup>3</sup> Jal, speaking with conviction because he has, as he says, "l'acte de baptême" before his eyes, declares for "le 6 octobre,"<sup>4</sup> while Assézat,<sup>5</sup> the editor of Diderot, presumably follows the supposedly authoritative Jal. Joseph Texte not unnaturally accepts the testimony of one or both of these immediate predecessors in favor also of the sixth.<sup>6</sup>

Curiously enough, Diderot himself, jocularly, and perhaps also with that rather customary indifference to accuracy in details which Grimm attributed to him,<sup>7</sup> gives his birth date as "le deux octobre." Thus he writes to Grimm, October 2, 1776 "Songez qu'au deux d'octobre prochain, j'aurai soixante trois, quatre ou cinq ans, que scals-je?"<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thus Nageon, *Mémoires sur la vie et les ouvrages de Diderot*, Paris, Brière, 1821, p 1, J Reinach, *Diderot*, Paris, 1894, p 11, n; A Collignon, *Diderot*, Paris, 1895, p 4; A Séché et Jules Bertaut, *Diderot*, Paris, n d, p 5, André Billy, *Diderot*, Paris, 1932, p. 11

<sup>2</sup> I K Luppel, *Diderot*, Paris, 1936, p 57

<sup>3</sup> Mme de Vandeul, *Mémoires sur Diderot*, in Diderot, *Œuvres* (Assézat ed, Paris, 1875-77), I, p xxix

<sup>4</sup> Auguste Jal, *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire*, 2nd ed, Paris, 1872, p 495 "L'acte du baptême," says Jal, "est sous mes yeux"

<sup>5</sup> Assézat, *op cit*, I, p lxiii

<sup>6</sup> Joseph Texte, Diderot, *Extraits*, Paris, Hachette, n d, 14th ed, *Introduction*, p xii

<sup>7</sup> Cf Grimm, Letter of January 26, 1765, *Corr lett*, Paris, Garnier, 1877-82, xvi, 423

<sup>8</sup> Diderot, *Corr inédite*, Babelon ed, Paris, 1931, I, 171



Slight as these differences are, it is well to settle the matter once for all by exact citation of a photographic copy of the "acte de baptême" of Diderot, now preserved at the "Mairie de Langres" <sup>9</sup>

Le 6<sup>e</sup> octobre 1713 aetté baptisé denis ne d'hier fils en legitime mariage de didier diderot me coutellier et d'angelique vigneron son pere et mere le parain denis diderot me coutellier la maraine claire vigneron Les quels ont signé avec le pere present

denis diderott	Claire vigneron
Didier Diderot	Rigollot
	Vic

Thus it is clear from this document, signed by the two "master cutlers," the father and the grandfather, by his mother's sister, Claire Vigneron, and by the Vicar Rigollot, that the infant Diderot, baptized on the 6th was "né d'hier" The date of his birth can therefore now be fixed definitely as October 5, 1713

As to the date of Diderot's death, most biographers agree that it occurred "le 30 juillet 1784" and, as Mme de Vandeul says, "le samedi" <sup>10</sup> Yet her husband, Diderot's son-in-law, writing early in August to his brother at Châteauroux, M. de Melville, informed him "L'illustre Diderot n'est plus, mon ami, il est mort subitement, le samedi 31 juillet" <sup>11</sup> Likewise the contemporary Meister, <sup>12</sup> in the *Correspondance littéraire*, addresses his readers in similar terms "M. Diderot n'est plus c'est le 31 juillet qu'il est mort" <sup>13</sup> The "acte de décès," quoted by Assézat from Jal's *Dictionnaire critique de biographie et d'histoire*, <sup>14</sup> gives the date of burial as "le 1<sup>er</sup> août" and speaks of Diderot as "décédé hier" <sup>15</sup> This testimony

<sup>9</sup> The registers of the Church of Saint-Pierre, where Diderot was baptized, are now at the "Mairie de Langres" (Information obtained through the courtesy of M Pierre Josserand of the Bibliothèque Nationale)

<sup>10</sup> Assézat, I, pp lvii-lviii

<sup>11</sup> Cited by Le Chanoine Marcel in *La Mort de Diderot*, Paris, Champion, 1925, p 45

<sup>12</sup> Meister at this time had definitely succeeded Grimm as editor of the *Correspondance littéraire* Cf the *Corr litt*, II, 234-236, X, 208-209, n Cf also G Lanson, *Manuel bibliographique*, p 625

<sup>13</sup> *Corr litt*, XIV, 17 (août 1784)

<sup>14</sup> Jal, *op cit*, p 496 As Assézat indicates, the document has also been reproduced by Paul Boiteau in his edition of the *Mémoires de Mme d'Épinay*, Paris, Charpentier, 1863, II, 496-497

<sup>15</sup> Assézat, I, p lxiv

agrees with that of M de Vandeul and of Meister<sup>16</sup> Verification of Jal's quotation, by comparison with the original document,<sup>17</sup> is now impossible The "acte de décès" of Diderot no longer exists, having been destroyed in the burning of the Hôtel de Ville during the Commune in May 1871<sup>18</sup> It should be noted, however, that "le samedi," given by both Mme de Vandeul and her husband as the day of Diderot's death, fell in 1784 on the 31st of July, not on the 30th<sup>19</sup> It is much more probable that Diderot's daughter was mistaken in her memories as to the date than as to the day of the week, particularly as the funeral, coming on Sunday, August 1, would serve to make the day before, Saturday, stand out in her mind Thus, unexpectedly, the testimony of Mme de Vandeul seems really to confirm that of her husband, of Meister, and of the "acte de décès" as reported by Jal

Canon Marcel, however, in his detailed and documented study, *La Mort de Diderot*, believes that Diderot died on Friday, July 30. There were indeed various contemporary rumors of doubtful value that the philosopher died in the country, in that case probably at his "pied-à-terre" at Sèvres,<sup>20</sup> that his body was transported secretly to the apartment which had been procured for him by Catherine II on the rue de Richelieu, and that M de Vandeul, in order to secure for Diderot a church funeral and burial in consecrated ground, engaged in an intrigue to make the priest believe

<sup>16</sup> Joseph Texte, though giving the 30th in one place, follows Assézat in regard to the 31st some pages later Cf Texte, *op cit*, pp xii, xxxiii

<sup>17</sup> It is worth noting that no one of the three citations of the "acte de décès" as given by Paul Bouteau, by Jal, or by Assézat, agrees exactly with any other, though the divergences are minor in character

<sup>18</sup> Cf Jal, *op cit*, "Préface de la seconde édition," pp 1-11 M Pierre Josserand of the Bibliothèque Nationale informs me "C'est à l'Hôtel de Ville qu'avaient été transportés tous les registres paroissiaux de l'ancien régime De la paroisse Saint-Roch ne subsiste qu'un registre baptistaire partiel de 1790"

<sup>19</sup> Note that the *Correspondance littéraire* mentions in another connection "le lundi 28 juin" 1784 (xiv, 3) A simple calculation shows therefore that the 31st of July fell that year on Saturday Mention of "le dimanche 11 juillet" (xiv, 10) and of "le jeudi 15" (xiv, 11) offers further confirmation of the previous statement A mathematical check on the accuracy of these dates may be obtained by use of the formula given in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (11th ed, 1910-11), Art *Calendar*, Vol IV, p 998.

<sup>20</sup> Le Chanoine Marcel, *op. cit*, pp 6, 44 Cf p 47.

that his father-in-law had died in Paris in the parish of Saint-Roch on the 31st instead of in the country on the 30th<sup>21</sup> In confirmation of this conclusion that Diderot's death was deliberately post-dated one day, Canon Marcel cites a letter by Mme Caroillon of Langres, mother of Diderot's son-in-law, M de Vandeul She states that she learned of the philosopher's death through a letter from another of her sons, M. des Tillières, and that this letter bore the date of July 30<sup>22</sup> The actual letter of M des Tillières, however, has not been found, so it cannot be stated positively that it was in fact so dated

Although Canon Marcel ordinarily places little reliance on the detailed accuracy of Mme de Vandeul's *Mémoires*—and often with good reason—he accepts as true the date she gives, the 30th, in spite of the fact that the day of the week, Friday instead of Saturday, does not tally with the rest of her statement On the other hand, he rejects the testimony of M de Vandeul, written immediately after the event, although in his case the date and the day of the week are both in agreement If M and Mme de Vandeul, and presumably M des Tillières and other members of the family at Paris also, had been engaged in an intrigue to deceive the public and the priest about the date of Diderot's death, would they not have been careful to agree upon the same day and date? Moreover, if Diderot had died twenty-four hours before the priest was called, would it have been possible to mislead the latter, accustomed to attend the dead and the dying, and consequently entirely able to distinguish between a body to which death had come recently and one which had been cold for nearly twenty-four hours? Evidently the priest could hardly have been deceived, unless we conclude that he also was in connivance with the intrigue attributed to M. de Vandeul,—and that certainly is not a conclusion which Canon Marcel is inclined to accept

Before we reject the testimony of M de Vandeul, in which date and day of the week both agree, the testimony of the *curé* Marduel of Saint-Roch as represented by the "acte de décès," which he signed, the testimony of Meister and other contemporaries,<sup>23</sup> it

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p 46.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p 45

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Le Chanoine Marcel, *op cit.*, p 45, n 123, where the *Journal de Paris* for August 3, 1784 and the *Mercur de France* for August 14, 1784, are cited as also giving July 31 as the date of Diderot's death

would seem that we must have more evidence than a single letter by Mme Carouillon, who was not on the spot and who was quoting another letter, probably written in haste, under stress of emotion, and in view of all the other evidence seemingly misdated. Indeed Mme Carouillon herself may have unintentionally been mistaken and given the date incorrectly.

Thus the death of Diderot, born on October 5, 1713, occurred in all probability on Saturday, July 31, 1784.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

*Ohio State University*

---

## A SECOND VERSION OF JOHN DAY'S *PEREGRINATIO SCHOLASTICA*

In 1881 A. H. Bullen published the *Peregrinatio Scholastica, or Learneinges Pullgrimage* in his edition of John Day's works. The text was based upon Sloane MS. 3150 in the British Museum. Another version exists, it once belonged to the Duke of Bridgewater and later to the Earl of Gower, and is now lodged in the Huntington Library.<sup>1</sup> It was known to Todd, who briefly described it in his note to Warton's "Remarks on Spenser's Allegorical Character"<sup>2</sup> It is a holograph, written in a fairly neat secretary hand that bears a marked resemblance to the other known MSS. by Day (Sloane 3150 and *The Parliament of Bees*, Lansdowne MS. 725).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have not seen the original MS. My information is based upon a photostatic copy, for which I am greatly obliged to Mr. R. B. Haselden, Curator of MSS. in the Huntington Library.

<sup>2</sup> H. J. Todd (*The Works of Spenser*, 1805, II, cxxvf) transcribed the title and some phrases from the table of contents. C. H. and T. Cooper (*Athenae Cantabrigienses*, II [1861], 476) apparently refer to the same MS. They supply information that could not have been found in Todd and declare that their version is among the Additional MSS. in the British Museum, where I was not able to locate it.

<sup>3</sup> The Huntington MS. consists of twenty-nine leaves, of which the twenty-five leaves of text are numbered. The verso of the last leaf has thirteen lines of writing. The dedication occupies a page and four lines, a table of contents occupies two pages and six lines, and a blank page comes between the dedication and the text. John Day's name appears on

The Sloane MS is dedicated to William Austin (1587-1634),<sup>4</sup> the author of *Certayne Devout, Godly, and Learned Meditations* and *Hæc Homo*. The Huntington MS, on the other hand, is inscribed to "Mr Thomas Dowtonn Gentlemann, & Brother of the Right Wo<sup>pp</sup> Companye of the vintners." The dedication, which has not been printed before, follows

Worthie Sr

*Learnenge* is soe preste downe vnder the Iron hande of *Necessitie*, And the poore professors of it, soe *Baffled* and scornde in the eye of vulgar opinion As weare it not for some ffewe generous sperrits, that protect and in spite of *Envie* cherishe it, This land w<sup>ch</sup> not longe since, and worthelie was titled *Hortum Musarum*, will shortly share title w<sup>th</sup> *Athens*, and be calld *stabulum Mularum* vpon this occasionn I haue composde a *Morall* poeme, and namde it the schollers pillgrimage In w<sup>ch</sup> amongst some easie and slight passadges for recreation onlie, I dare promise you shall meete w<sup>th</sup> matter, well worthie more serious meditacionn w<sup>ch</sup> with my vnfaigned loue, And Tender of my most faithfull service, I dedicate to you freindlie and favourable acceptance, commendinge you and you more materiall proceedinges vnto the protectionn of the Allmightie

Yours in what his poore Indeuours maie—

JOHN DAYE

Thomas Dowton, or as his name is spelt in current reference books Thomas Downton, was an Elizabethan and Jacobean actor who may have first entered the profession in 1593 as one of Lord Strange's men.<sup>5</sup> His name appears in a list of Admiral's men that is dated December 14, 1594.<sup>6</sup> He acted regularly with the Admiral's men from 1597 to 1603, with the Prince's company until 1612, and with Palsgrave's certainly until 1615 and probably until 1618.<sup>7</sup> On February 15, 1617-8, he married a vintner's widow and became

the title-page, in the heading of the salutation, and at the end of the dedication.

<sup>4</sup> The MS *Parlament of Bees* is dedicated to the same man, although his name appears in the variant spelling "Augustine" See E K Chambers, *Elizabethan Stage*, III, 287

<sup>5</sup> Chambers, II, 124, W. W Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, p. 41, and *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 263.

<sup>6</sup> Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, I, 5, II, 262, 263

<sup>7</sup> E Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors*, pp 117-119.

a vintner.<sup>8</sup> He drew up his will on July 25, 1625,<sup>9</sup> and the will was proved in the same year.<sup>10</sup>

The dedication of the Huntington MS to Dowton the vintner indicates that the work must have been completed between 1618 or 1619, by which date he had certainly become a vintner (as the records of St. Giles, Cripplegate, show),<sup>11</sup> and 1625, when he died.

The question of priority now arises. That the Sloane MS. is the earlier is suggested by the dedication of the MS. *Parlament of Bees*, in which Day writes to William Augustine (Austin) as follows

Noble Sr

The first, & last bothome that ever I lancht vpon the strange, (& to me then vnknowne sea) calld *Mare Dedicatorium*, was bownd for *Cape Bona Speranza*, where yo<sup>r</sup> wor<sup>sh</sup> was governo<sup>r</sup>, And the most of my Ladeing (at that Tyme being an vnknoweing venturer,) were but *feriae Nugae* at the best, yet they returnd me more then a deseru'd gratuitie, w<sup>ch</sup> emboldens me to a second adventure, fraught w<sup>th</sup> a more pleasing & vendible commoditie.<sup>12</sup>

This dedication undoubtedly refers to the Sloane MS of the *Peregrinatio*, containing Day's earlier dedication to Austin, and suggests that it was his first and only dedicated work. If one accepts this statement, it follows that the Huntington MS is later than both the Sloane MS and the MS *Parlament of Bees*. But since Dowton (to whom, it will be remembered, the Huntington MS is dedicated) died nine years before Austin, one is thus forced to assume that Day revised the Sloane *Peregrinatio* and dedicated it to another patron while Austin was still alive. The very terms of the MS

<sup>8</sup> Chambers, II, 313

<sup>9</sup> G. E. Bentley, "Records of Players in the Parish of St. Giles, Cripplegate," *PMLA*, XLIV (1929), 801. (One of the St. Giles's entries reads as follows: "1617 8 Oct [Buried] John Daye svant to Tho Doughten Player." This John Daye cannot possibly be the dramatist and tract writer, who lived until 1640.)

<sup>10</sup> *Index of Wills Proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury, 1620-9* (The Index Library, London: The British Record Society, XLIV, 1912), VI, 90.

<sup>11</sup> Bentley, *loc. cit.* "1619 11 June Buried Jane daughter of Tho Downton Vintener."

<sup>12</sup> The text is based upon a photostatic copy of Lansdowne MS 725 in the British Museum. Bullen in his transcript read "desird" for "deservd" and "emboldend" for "emboldens."

*Parlament of Bees* dedication argue against such an assumption. Day dedicated this work to Austin precisely because he had been well rewarded for the Sloane *Peregrinatio*, he would have had no reason to search for another patron. Hence the Huntington MS must be the earlier. A similar argument can be used to date the Sloane MS definitely after 1625. That Dowton accepted the Huntington MS. is strongly suggested by an acrostic poem on his name signed John Day,<sup>13</sup> which reads like a note of thanks for Dowton's "compassionate harte."<sup>14</sup> It is unlikely, therefore, that Day rewrote the *Peregrinatio* until after Dowton's death.

A further proof, perhaps trivial, that the Huntington MS. precedes the Sloane MS. is the correction of *Perigrinatio* to *Peregrinatio*.

Clearly, then, Day is guilty, in the MS. *Parlament of Bees*, of a falsification. It is possible, however, to suggest in extenuation that Day's earlier patron had died, that the work had not been published, and that Day was in need. Day does not, after all, indulge in gross flattery, and the worst that can be said of the dedication is that it implies in Day a higher degree of independence than he possessed.

Although the Sloane MS. retains the substance of the earlier version, it is, nevertheless, a thorough reworking of the material. Tractates 16 and 17 are entirely new. In a few instances material is transferred from one tractate to another, thus Tractate 15, which in the main follows Tractate 16 of the original, incorporates the description of Despair from Tractate 15. In addition to rearrangement, there is considerable reduction and enlargement. Even when the earlier version is closely followed, there are some verbal changes. As an example, take a passage from Tractate 3. Huntington MS (p. 5<sup>v</sup>):

. . . her Buskins weare Artefullie enlaede w<sup>th</sup> corral, and neatlie buttond w<sup>th</sup> diamonds In w<sup>ch</sup> the amorous contentions betwixt *Venus* and *Adonis* were storied out to the life, at w<sup>ch</sup> she semde to spurne, and trample vnder

<sup>13</sup> The poem, which is preserved at Dulwich, has been printed by J. F. Herbert, [Old] *Shakespeare Society Papers*, I (1844), 19; Bullen, *The Works of John Day*, Introduction, pp. 12, 13, Nungezer, *A Dictionary of Actors*, pp. 119, 120

<sup>14</sup> Greg (*Henslowe Papers*, pp. 126, 127, and *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 263), unaware of the Huntington MS. and of the connection between Day and Dowton, does not believe that the dramatist was the author of the acrostic poem.

ffoote in scorne, vpon her head she wore a kinde of rich but careles *Tyara*,  
vpon that a girland of carnations and Rose buds scaice blowne and new  
pluckt out of the civett bosome of the Springe, a trew *Hieroglyphick* of  
Chastetye

Sloane MS. <sup>15</sup>

. Her buskins were enchasht with corall and buttond with diamonds, in  
which were lively exprest the amorous contentions betwixt Venus and  
Adonis, which, in signe of hate to loue, she send to spurne and scorne (as  
they say) with her heeles Uppon her head stood a garland of rose buds  
and carnations halfe blowne (new pluckt out of the bosome of the springe)  
which, quickend with the heat of her breath, send to spring and growe  
afreshe

A general description of all the changes would be confusing, a  
detailed one extiemely complicated. It will suffice for the present  
to note that the alterations enhance the vividness and realism of the  
story.

M. E. BORISH

*College of William and Mary*

## A POSSIBLE SOURCE FOR THE FEMALE DISGUISE IN BYRON'S *DON JUAN*

One possible source has been already noted for Juan's disguise  
as a woman and his subsequent adventures in the sultan's harem in  
Byron's *Don Juan*, Cantos v and vi Captain Rees Gronow sug-  
gested that a prank of Dan Mackinnon, a nineteenth century wag,  
inspired the incident.

Another of his [Mackinnon's] freaks very nearly brought him to a court-  
martial Lord Wellington was curious about visiting a convent near  
Lisbon, and the lady abbess made no difficulty, Mackinnon, hearing this,  
contrived to get clandestinely within the sacred walls, and it was generally  
supposed that it was neither his first nor his second visit At all events,  
when Lord Wellington arrived, Dan Mackinnon was to be seen among the  
nuns, dressed out in their sacred costume with his head and whiskers  
shaved, and as he possessed good features, he was declared to be one of the  
best-looking amongst those chaste dames It was supposed that this adven-  
ture, which was known to Lord Byron, suggested a similar episode in *Don*

<sup>15</sup> *Peregrinatio Scholastica*, ed. Bullen, p 27



*Juan*, the scene being laid in the East I might say more about Dan's adventures in the convent, but have no wish to be scandalous.<sup>1</sup>

Elsewhere Gronow referred to the acquaintanceship of Byron and Mackinnon at Lisbon during which the former "was much amused with Dan Mackinnon's funny stories"<sup>2</sup>

Gronow's theory is not well authenticated. His earliest memoirs appeared thirty-seven years after Byron's death and his accuracy when retailing second-hand experiences is questionable.<sup>3</sup> In a political note Byron refers to the case of Mackinnon,<sup>4</sup> but he never mentions the man or the prank in his published letters. Eleven years elapsed between Byron's short Lisbon visit and the writing of Canto v in 1820, time for the anecdote to be forgotten unless recalled by new information. Besides the use of female disguise (under very different circumstances) there is only one similarity in incident between Juan's adventures and Mackinnon's, as told *afterwards* by Gronow: the sultan and the ladies of the harem commend Juan's feminine good looks.<sup>5</sup> The likeness in mood seems unimportant. Juan, like Mackinnon, misbehaves,<sup>6</sup> but Juan misbehaves similarly throughout the poem.

An alternative theory arises from the knowledge that Byron, while writing the *Don Juan*, used a book where disguise as a woman is employed four times. In 1821 he wrote to his publisher, "By the way, much of the description of the *furniture* in Canto 3<sup>d</sup> is taken from *Tully's Tripoli* (pray note this), and the rest from my own observation."<sup>7</sup> As has been long known, Byron borrowed details of clothing<sup>8</sup> as well as household furniture from this narrative.

<sup>1</sup> Gronow, *Reminiscences*, London, 1862, 85-86, *Recollections and Anecdotes of the Camp, the Court, and the Clubs*, London, 1870, 62, *Reminiscences and Recollections*, London, 1889, I, 62. Coleridge, *The Works of Lord Byron*, London, 1903, VI, 276, drew attention to Gronow's suggestion.

<sup>2</sup> Gronow, *Last Recollections*, London, 1866, 100, *Anecdotes of Celebrities*, London, 1870, 259, *Reminiscences and Recollections*, II, 259.

<sup>3</sup> *DNB*, VIII, 713.

<sup>4</sup> *Works*, VI, 69.

<sup>5</sup> *Don Juan*, V, clv, VI, xxxvi.

<sup>6</sup> *Don Juan*, VI, lxx-lxxxv.

<sup>7</sup> Prothero, *Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, London, 1900, V, 346 [Tully, Miss] *Narrative of a Ten Years' Residence at Tripoli in Africa*, London, 1816. For authorship see Preface, III.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Don Juan*, III, lxi-lxxvii with the *Tripoli*, 30-32, 133-137.

The first two disguises recorded by Miss Tully do not spring from amorous motives. Sidi Useph, the son of the bashaw, at enmity with his family, comes robed as a woman to a feast of Turkish ladies in order to overhear their conversation. His presence is discovered and he flees in the ensuing confusion. Again he is in the habit of coming so disguised to his sister's apartment within the harem until on his third visit "an awkward plait in his baracan" gives him away.<sup>9</sup> The other disguises are used in a love affair where the lady is more eager than the man. Selima plots to catch sight of her betrothed, Sidi Mahmoud, is piqued by his indifference, grows melancholy and then sick. The servant Ismaili decoys the lady to a small house in the garden where Sidi Mahmoud is found, robed as a country woman. After Sidi's departure for Naples and his rumored defections, Selima again falls ill. Once more on his return the young man dresses as a woman, seeks out the faithful Ismaili, and goes this time to his betrothed's apartments.<sup>10</sup> Miss Tully has earlier commented on Turkish courtships, "Notwithstanding the severest restrictions of the Prophet Mahomet on this point and the seclusion of a female's life, yet by the help of emissaries (which for money are to be found in this country on all occasions), those betrothed sometimes obtain with difficulty and danger a distant view of each other and even learn each other's sentiments."<sup>11</sup>

Miss Tully's letters therefore indicate that disguise as a woman was not infrequent among the Turks. She refers to the general use of emissaries and to specific examples of disguise and connivance by servants in the aid of a love-sick lady. Byron's Gulbeyaz, smitten by the charms of Juan in the slave market, tells her eunuch Baba to fetch him. It is Baba who prudently arranges the female disguise and conveys the indifferent lad to her.<sup>12</sup> Her amorous malady surpasses Selima's in intensity and according to Baba is still uncured at the end of the episode.<sup>13</sup>

No similarity of Juan's adventures with Mackinnon's or Sidi Mahmoud's is close enough to preclude the possibility of sheer in-

<sup>9</sup> *Tripoli*, 147, 261

<sup>10</sup> *Tripoli*, 302-4, 305

<sup>11</sup> *Tripoli*, 301-2

<sup>12</sup> *Don Juan*, v, lxxiii-xcv, cxiv

<sup>13</sup> *Don Juan*, v, cviii-cxli, vi, iii-viii, cv-cxi, cxv

vention by Byron. But, since Byron admittedly used localized details from Tully in the Eastern episodes of the *Don Juan*, since he was fond of factual material as a basis for other cantos,<sup>14</sup> since he often and variously reiterated the boast

Besides, my Muse by no means deals in fiction  
She gathers a repertory of facts, (Don Juan, XIV, 1111)

are the following conjectures too wild? After 1816 Byron learned from the Tully letters that female disguise was an actual Turkish practice, sometimes used to appease a loving lady. The first idea of putting Juan into a harem in the dress of a woman may have germinated from that knowledge. If Byron had heard of Mackinnon's escapade, he may have recalled it when he came across the staid Tully episodes and, consciously or unconsciously, have fused the two impressions in creating the adventures of Juan. Byron's statement when he acknowledged some indebtedness to Tully's *Tripoli* is important. "No man ever . . . made his materials more his own"<sup>15</sup> But if Byron owed anyone anything for the Juan disguise, he would seem to have found the more timely and accurate suggestion in Miss Tully's letters.

MARGARET E. MCGING

Low-Haywood School, Stamford, Conn

---

## MOORE TO HOBHOUSE AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER

The William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, an adjunct of the University of California at Los Angeles, contains the following unpublished letter from Tom Moore to John Cam Hobhouse.

Newstead Abbey

Jan<sup>y</sup> 29<sup>th</sup> 1828

My dear Hobhouse Being here alone I cannot help—with the thoughts which the place inspires—writing to you. I returned here for the purpose of making some further inquiries of Rushton<sup>1</sup> and old Nanny Smith,<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Canto II, Dalzell, *Shipwrecks and Disasters at Sea*, Cantos VII and VIII, Castelnau, *Essai sur l'Histoire Ancienne et Moderne de la Nouvelle Russie*

<sup>15</sup> *Letters*, V, 347

<sup>1</sup> Robert Rushton, the son of one of Byron's tenants

<sup>2</sup> An old servant at Newstead Abbey.

whom I dare say you remember, as she does you. How often I wish you were with me, or that I could bring some voice out of these walls to tell me all that happened in those joyous days when they were inhabited, I will say, by as brilliant a knot of young fellows as ever began the career of life together. I have been passing some days with Hodgson<sup>3</sup> at Mr Robt Arkwright's,<sup>4</sup> and found far more fun, as well as feeling, under that parsonic japan of his than I gave him the least credit for. He not only told me many pleasant things, but gave me some letters & extracts of letters, which place poor Byron in all that amiable light, which it is my great wish & object to surround him with. I have indeed, been lucky beyond my most sanguine expectations in this neighbourhood, having found a family at Southwell<sup>5</sup> among whom he passed a considerable part of his early days, and who have given me letters & unpublished poems of his, written at a period which is now the most interesting of his life, as being the least known. I have got, too, a curious draft of the Will he made in 1811, with his instructions in the margin, and it is of course no new information to you that, in that Will, he left all his personal property to be divided between you, Hodgson, S. Davies<sup>6</sup> &, I believe, the Rev<sup>d</sup> Mr Beecher [sic]<sup>7</sup>. I am to dine with the Musters's<sup>8</sup> next Sunday, and expect to get from her two or three little unpublished things which they tell me she possesses.

By the bye, ought not you or I to give this beast Hunt a dressing in the *Ed. Review*? It is the only way—beyond a contemptuous sentence or two—in which one can condescend to notice him, and I really thing [sic] a good sousing of ridicule, "without mitigation or remorse" is a thing that either you or I ought to inflict upon him.

You mentioned, in one of your late letters, B's translation of the *Francesca*,<sup>9</sup> and said that you took for granted I had it. I have not, nor have ever seen it, and I should have told you this before, but that, in the humour I was then in, I was afraid it would look like asking ~~you~~ [sic] for it. This humour, however, is now gone by, and I not only mention it, but will most cheerfully ask for the manuscript, if there is any chance of your being able to give it to me.

I have been interrupted in my letter by a conversation with Nanny Smith, in which she frequently referred me to "Hobhouse" and

<sup>3</sup> Francis Hodgson (1781-1852), provost of Eton, translator of Juvenal, minor poet, one of Byron's early friends.

<sup>4</sup> A singer and composer of some talent.

<sup>5</sup> The Pigots. Elizabeth Pigot was Byron's staunchest admirer.

<sup>6</sup> Scrope Davies, one of the "Trinity Musketeers."

<sup>7</sup> Rev John Thomas Becher (1770-1848), prominent writer on social economy. On Becher's advice Byron suppressed his first book.

<sup>8</sup> Mrs John Musters was Mary Chaworth, who rejected Byron.

<sup>9</sup> The 46 line fragment, "*Francesca of Rimini*," published in *The Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, London, 1830, II, 309-311.

"Claridge,"<sup>10</sup> his Lordship's "Fadge," for whatever she herself was unable to tell me. She has also been playing the "anus fatidica" about Lady B

I have time for no more—Ever

Yours

T. MOORE

If you cannot give me the Francesca, it is no matter—only do not *write* me about it, and receive me kindly when we meet, which I hope will be in about ten days

Nottingham  
3<sup>d</sup> flat

I have just received a letter here from Murray, which has been delayed by my absence— It is about Byron, & I have but a minute to answer it

Moore's thoroughness in harrying out everyone, even servants, who might contribute an anecdote or a letter is highly commendable. Also, in defense of his often attacked editorial practices, one finds a useful weapon in the phrase "extracts of letters." Obviously, he was at the mercy of Byron's well-wishing but editorially conscienceless friends. He could print no more than he was given, and the exigencies of weaving loose threads into a coherent pattern occasionally necessitated some violence to the texts. More revealing, however, is the biographer's admission that he proposes to place Byron in an "amiable light." Quite understandably, he wished to place in proper focus the distortions of Dallas, Medwin, and Hunt, but he became over-zealous and erred on the side of sympathy. It remained for a lesser man, John Galt, to capture Byron's elusive personality and to explain its contradictions.<sup>11</sup>

Moore's bitterness against Hunt is not unexpected, though certainly unprovoked. Moore had jealously anticipated Hunt's *Lord Byron and Some of his Contemporaries* by publishing in *The Times* a vitriolic fable called "The 'Living Dog' and the 'Dead Lion'." To this attack Hunt, or one of his friends, had replied in kind.<sup>12</sup> The somewhat querulous tone which Moore adopts toward Hob-

<sup>10</sup> John Claridge, afterwards Sir John, one of Byron's juniors and favorites at Harrow

<sup>11</sup> Galt felt that in treating Byron, Moore represented "only the sunny side—the limning is correct, but the likeness is too radiant and conciliatory" (*Life of Byron*, London, 1830, p. iv)

<sup>12</sup> See *The Letters and Journals of Lord Byron*, ed. R. E. Prothero, London, 1898, II, 461-462. Moore's poem may be found in his collected works.

house in speaking of the "Francesca" reminds us that though the two men put up a show of friendship, neither quite trusted the other

BRADFORD A BOOTH

*The University of California  
at Los Angeles*

---

A MANUSCRIPT ADDITION TO HAZLITT'S ESSAY  
"ON THE FEAR OF DEATH"

W Carew Hazlitt, grandson of the essayist, states that the following passage occurred "in the autograph MS of an 'Essay on the Fear of Death,' written in 1821, but it was omitted in the printed version in 'Table Talk.'"

I want an eye to cheer me, a hand to guide me, a breast to lean on, all which I shall never have, but shall stagger into my grave without them, old before my time, unloved and unlovely, unless— I would have some creature love me before I die Oh' for the parting hand to ease the fall!<sup>1</sup>

That this deleted passage refers to Sarah Walker, heroine of Hazlitt's *Liber Amoris*, is proven by a parallel paragraph in that volume under the caption "Written in a blank leaf of Endymion".

I want a hand to guide me, an eye to cheer me, a bosom to repose on, all which I shall never have, but shall stagger into my grave, old before my time, unloved and unlovely, unless S L keeps her faith with me<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> W Carew Hazlitt, *Memours of William Hazlitt* (London, 1867), II, 11. The MS of this essay has been lost or destroyed, and the above deletion is not mentioned in the notes to the *Complete Works of William Hazlitt*, ed P P Howe (London, 1930-4), VIII, 373-4

Before Hazlitt published "On the Conduct of Life" (written at Renton Inn, Berwickshire, February, 1822) in Paris *Table Talk* (1825), he cut out a long passage from his MS His son, however, reinstated the passage when he reprinted the essay in *Literary Remains of the Late William Hazlitt* (London, 1836) This MS addition contains the following sentence "But should you let your blood stagnate in some deep metaphysical question, or refine too much in your ideas of the sex, forgetting yourself in a dream of exalted perfection, you will want an eye to cheer you, a hand to guide you, a bosom to lean on, and will stagger into your grave, old before your time, unloved and unlovely" (See *Complete Works*, XVII, 3947)

<sup>2</sup> *Liber Amoris*, Works, IX, 114 Hazlitt frequently addresses Sarah Walker as S L in this book, see, e g, "To S L," IX, 132 Perhaps this passionate outbreak actually found expression in Hazlitt's copy of Keats's

When composing "On the Fear of Death" Hazlitt doubtless wrote the foregoing expunged passage just after the following one, which appears in the essay

My public and private hopes have been left a ruin, or remain only to mock me. I would wish them to be re-edified. I should like to see some prospect of good to mankind, such as my life began with. I should like to leave some sterling work behind me. I should like to have some friendly hand to consign me to the grave.<sup>3</sup>

In the third edition of *Table-Talk*, edited by Hazlitt's son, "On the Fear of Death" was printed with a concluding paragraph not used by its author in either of the editions of this volume issued during his lifetime, as Howe observes, no explanation was given by the son for its inclusion.<sup>4</sup> However, in a letter to Hazlitt from Colburn, publisher of the second volume of *Table-Talk*, in which the selection originally appeared, there occurs a reference to an ending to the essay

Dear Sir,

I send herewith all the 2nd vol., except the end of the 16th essay on the 'Fear of Death'. We want one essay yet to make out the volume of a tolerable size—which one it is desirable to bring in before the present 16th. Let me beg you will send me presently one of the essays, otherwise I shall not be able to publish by the 1st June, which is very important.

Yours truly,

H. Colburn.<sup>5</sup>

There is no certainty that the conclusion published by the son

poem, for W. Carew Hazlitt says "and with these [Milman's *Fazio* and Holcroft's *Road to Ruin*], and two or three other exceptions, the few books which belonged to him have completely disappeared. Where is his copy of Keats's 'Endymion'? Where is the 'Liber Amoris' in crimson velvet, which he took with him to Italy? Where is his 'Essay on Human Action,' enriched, as he left it, with his own notes in his own hand?" (*Memours*, II, 272)

<sup>3</sup> "On the Fear of Death," *Works*, VIII, 325-6. It is quite possible, however, that the last sentence was added later to replace the deleted passage, the first sentence of which mentions both "hand" and "grave."

<sup>4</sup> The paragraph is quoted *Works*, VIII, 374.

<sup>5</sup> Quoted by W. C. Hazlitt, *Memours*, II, 5, but not referred to by Howe. Mr. Hazlitt dates this letter 1821, but it is obvious that it refers to 1822, for "On the Fear of Death" is listed as among those essays completed at Renton in a letter to Patmore, March, 1822 (see *Memours*, II, 68).

is the one mentioned by Colburn, nor, if it is, do we know whether or not Hazlitt intended to end his selection with it or whether or not he deleted it in the manuscript to which the son presumably had access. Since its author was securing his divorce during the first half of 1822 and traveled about considerably during this trying period, perhaps he did not receive the ending in proof from Colburn in time to incorporate it in the published essay. In lieu of the publisher's letter, therefore, the possibility is strong that the ending, unlike the foregoing reference to Sarah Walker, was not deleted but omitted by force of circumstances.<sup>6</sup>

STEWART C. WILCOX

*University of Hawaii*

### BURKE'S ERROR REGARDING SUGAR-CRYSTALS

Edmund Burke's essay *The Sublime and Beautiful* (1757), launched in the midst of an age which had been setting up standards of good taste, gains perhaps its greatest novelty from the pure sensationalism of its aesthetic—of rendering beauty not in terms of rules but of qualities like clarity, smoothness, and sweetness, and discovering the sublime in antithetical qualities. Such an experimental attitude leads Burke readily into displaying an amateur's acquaintance with optics, the anatomy of the eye, the physiology of pain and pleasure, natural selection, and other scientific topics. In general, his information is fairly accurate if measured by the science of his day, but when in IV xx1 Burke comes to analyze the physiology of taste he makes a blunder that is strikingly naive. He observes that "every species of salt examined by the microscope, has its own distinct, regular, invariable form. That of nitre is a pointed oblong, that of sea salt an exact cube, that of sugar a perfect globe." This notion that sugar-crystals are globular leads him to assume that the pleasing taste of sugar upon the tongue comes from the same tactile sensation as that produced by a handful of marbles, for there "is nothing near so pleasant to the touch as several globes, where the hand gently rises to one and falls to another, and this pleasure is greatly increased if the globes are in

<sup>6</sup> Against this hypothesis is the fact that during the latter part of May, 1822, the essayist spent a hurried week in London (where he had not been since January) to see the second volume of *Table-Talk* through the press.



motion, and sliding over one another" He supposes furthermore that "in sweet liquors, the parts of the fluid vehicle though most probably round, are yet so minute as to conceal the figure of their component parts from the nicest inquisition of the microscope," and thus he ingeniously applies to "sweetness, the beautiful of the taste" the same principle by which he had found beauty in smooth tones, colors, and contours

Where Burke picked up this misinformation about sugar-crystals is at first glance puzzling Nowhere in 17th or 18th century books on crystallography and microscopy have I been able to find the mistake duplicated, Professor Marjorie Nicolson, whose monographs have cast much light upon similar subjects,<sup>1</sup> kindly tells me that she has found no such error in the mass of contemporary literature which she has read If Burke had turned to the most popular book on microscopy in his time, Henry Baker's *The Microscope Made Easy* (3rd ed, London, 1744), p 258, he would have found support for his theory that the shape of "saline Particles" has something to do with the pleasure or pain of their taste, but the plate of illustrations accompanying this discussion correctly shows in Fig III that "the Salts of Sugar candy'd" are polyhedrons<sup>2</sup>

The source of Burke's error, I venture to suggest, will be found not in books on experimental science but in Lucietus's *De rerum natura*—from which Burke elsewhere quotes two passages to illustrate sublimity<sup>3</sup> Burke's contention in IV xx that smoothness, in all its aspects, is closely linked with "relaxation" of the senses and ultimately with the perception of beauty, while "bodies which

<sup>1</sup> Notably in "The Microscope and English Imagination," *Smith College Studies in Modern Languages*, vol XVI

<sup>2</sup> On pp 263-64 Baker confirms Burke's statements regarding the shape of nitre and of sea salt crystals Nehemiah Grew, "A Discourse of the Diversities and causes of Tastes," in his *Anatomy of Plants* (London, 1682), p 286, attributes differences in tastes to "the Principles" of various substances "Those of all *Fluid Bodies*, *qua Fluid*, and therefore of *Water*, *Oyl*, and *Spirit*, I conceive to be *Globular*, but *hollow*, and with holes in their Sides These Principles affect the *Organs of Sense*, according to the variety of their Figures, and of their *Mixture* So those which are sharp or poynted and those which are *springy*, are fitted to produce any stronger *Taste* and those which are round, are apt, of their own Nature, to produce a *weaker* or *softer* one" But no mention is made of sweetness or sugar in this connection

<sup>3</sup> In II v and V v

are rough and angular, rouse and vellicate the organs of feeling, causing a violent tension," invites comparison with Lucretius, II 422 ff.

omnis enim, sensus quae mulcet cumque, <figura>  
haut sine principali aliquo levore creatast,  
at contra quaecumque molesta atque aspera constat,  
non aliquo sine materiae squalore repertast

Burke explains more fully why water is smooth and relaxing, IV. XXI

For as fluidity depends, according to the most general opinion, on the roundness, smoothness, and weak cohesion of the component parts of any body, and as water acts merely as a simple fluid, it follows that the cause of its fluidity is likewise the cause of its relaxing quality namely, the smoothness and slippery texture of its parts

This is very much like Lucretius's theory about the nature of liquids, which follows his famous molecular and atomic hypothesis

illa quidem debent e levibus atque rotundis  
esse magis, fluvido quae corpori e liquida constant  
nec retinentur enim inter se glomeramina quaeque \*

Of water Lucretius says specifically, in the next Book

namque movetur aqua et tantillo momine flutat  
quippe volubilibus parvisque creata figuris \*

And the poet goes on to speak of honey, with its greater viscosity. One recalls Burke's speculation, previously cited, that "in sweet liquors, the parts of the fluid vehicle [are] most probably round," which follows his assumption about the shape of sugar-crystals. In making this mistake Burke probably had in mind these remarks of Lucretius on the globular structure of liquids, it is a likely guess, at least, that Lucretius's molecule becomes Burke's 'globular body'. The poet's association of this structure with sweetness of taste, while harsh substances "vellicate the organs of feeling," becomes evident in the following passage

huc accedit uti mellis lactisque liquores  
iucundo sensu linguae tractentur in ore,  
at contra taetra absinthii natura ferique  
centauri foedo pertorquent ora sapore,

---

\* II 451 ff

\* III 189-190

ut facile agnoscas e levibus atque rotundis  
 esse ea quae sensus iucunde tangere possunt  
 at contra quae amara atque aspera cumque videntur  
 haec magis amatis inter se nexa teneri  
 proptereaque solere vias rescindere nostris  
 sensibus introituque suo perrumpere corpus.<sup>6</sup>

Burke's notion of a globular sugar-crystal—probably as alien to 18th century books on science as it is to nature—came to him, I think, through a simple association of ideas to which the ancient poet gives a clue. Several other sensory observations in Burke's essay seem to echo Lucretius.<sup>7</sup> Indeed throughout his great poem Lucretius, being 'Epicurus owne sonne,' naturally creates an aesthetic of pure feeling—and this, as we see in *The Sublime and Beautiful*, is also Burke's striking characteristic.

DIXON WECTER

Henry E Huntington Library

#### A BORROWER FROM QUARLES AND HERBERT

To the three spurious editions of Francis Quarles's *Enchiridion* called to our attention ten years ago by Mr. W L Ustick<sup>1</sup> may

<sup>6</sup> II 398 ff. In IV 615 ff. Lucretius repeats that smooth particles produce on the palate a pleasant taste, and rough ones an unpleasant sensation. He applies the same principles to other senses, e g, in II 408 ff. he says that the squeaking of a saw generates rough 'particles' (*elementa*) of sound while music creates smooth ones. Similarly Burke, III xxv, contrasts "notes which are shrill, or harsh, or deep," with beautiful ones which are "clear, even, smooth, and weak."

<sup>7</sup> Thus Burke's discussion of perspective in architecture, especially in reference to the optical effect of colonnades, in II x, is almost a paraphrase of Lucretius on the same subject, IV 426-431. The poet's catalogue of the awe inspiring aspects of nature and how they inspire the terror and reverence of man, in V 1204 ff. ("nam cum suspicimus magni caelestia mundi," etc.), may have afforded Burke some hints in his treatment of the same phenomena as sources of the sublime in II ii, II xiii, and II xvii. Finally one may conjecture that Lucretius's long and eloquent passage in Book III on the intimate correlation between body and mind, sensation and mental state ("verum ubi vementi magis est commota metu mens," 152 ff.), may have had its effect upon Burke's psycho-physical viewpoint, notably in IV. iii when he discusses fear and terror.

<sup>1</sup> "Later editions of Quarles's *Enchiridion*," *Library*, Ser. 4, IX (1928), 184-6.

now be added a fourth *Miscellanea*, or, a mixture of choyce observations and institutions, moral and divine, composed for private use Being the product of spare hours, and the meditations of J. H . . . London, printed for Thomas Helder, at the Sign of the Angel in Little-Brittain. 1669,<sup>2</sup> for sixty-four of its ninety-two chapters are wholly or partially from Quarles's little book of piety and practical advice. In many instances entire chapters are reprinted, sometimes without any change and sometimes with only an unimportant word or two changed. Occasionally the compiler took a section from the *Enchiridion* and expanded it with a few sentences of his own.<sup>3</sup> In other cases one chapter of the *Miscellanea* is a blend of several chapters of the *Enchiridion*.<sup>4</sup>

Thomas Helder, the publisher of the *Miscellanea*, did not enter it in the *Stationers' Register*, perhaps he felt that his recently acquired rights to the *Enchiridion* would serve for the *Miscellanea* also, the two works being so nearly the same. Assignment of the *Enchiridion* to him was entered in the *Stationers' Register* on June 21, 1668, or about a year before the publication of the *Miscellanea*. After obtaining the rights to the *Enchiridion*, Helder issued a number of editions of it. It is advertised, along with *Paradise Lost* and several other works, on recto A<sub>6</sub> of the *Miscellanea*.

Besides drawing on Quarles for about two thirds of his book, the compiler made unacknowledged use of a large part of George Herbert's poem, "Providence" (p. 116-26). The poem, with the title omitted, appears in the middle of a chapter of prose. The borrower apparently made no great effort to conceal his theft, for the first stanza is the same as in the original.<sup>5</sup> But for his second stanza he used the ninth of Herbert's poem and thereafter omitted a number of those in the original.

It is clear that the compiler (or possibly the publisher or someone else into whose hands the selections fell) intended his work to be regarded as original. In his dedication to Arthur Annesley, the

<sup>2</sup> According to the *Term catalogues*, I, 488, and II, 232, Helder issued a "second edition" of this work in 1682 and another in 1688.

<sup>3</sup> For example, compare *Miscellanea*, chap. 65, with *Enchiridion*, cent. II, chap. 51.

<sup>4</sup> Thus, for example, chap. 17 of the *Miscellanea* is a blend of *Enchiridion*, cent. II, chap. 87, 97; cent. III, chap. 18, 28, 37, and cent. IV, chap. 74.

<sup>5</sup> In this comparison I am using *The English works of George Herbert*, ed. by George Herbert Palmer (Boston and New York, 1907), III, 79-95.

first earl of Anglesey, he declares "this Mite of my first endeavours owes its being to your Lordships favour," and implores his "Lordships Correction of these imperfect lines" In his foreword to the reader he explains "The influence of the times, giving more than wonted spare hours, I did Compose this small Treatise for private use But hoping this way to serve thee, when other opportunities may be denyed, I have published it"

This "J H" I have been unable to identify. Kennedy, Smith and Johnson attribute the book to Joseph Henshaw, bishop of Peterborough from 1663 to 1679, but cite no evidence<sup>6</sup> Henshaw was the author of two books of meditations, *Horae succisivae, or spare houres of meditations upon our dutie to God, others, ourselves* (1631), and *Meditations miscellaneous, holy, humane* (1637) It is possible that the *Miscellanea* was compiled by Helder himself, or by someone hired by Helder, in an effort to satisfy a demand for a popular type of literature, and to make buyers think they were getting something new. Some doubt, however, is cast upon this conjecture by the pious and intimate dedication to the Earl of Anglesey At the same time, it seems unlikely that Joseph Henshaw, if he had compiled the book and wanted people to think that it was his own work, would have taken it to Thomas Helder for publication, for Thomas Helder, the publisher of the *Enchiridion* and the holder of the rights to it, could hardly have failed to recognize the source of the *Miscellanea*. Whoever was responsible for the *Miscellanea*, his wholesale stealing from such well-known writers as Quarles and Herbert suggests either considerable daring on his part, or an attitude in the seventeenth century toward plagiarism even more different from our own than is commonly supposed

HAROLD REESE

*Northwestern University*

---

<sup>6</sup> *Dictionary of anonymous and pseudonymous English literature*, New Ed, iv (1928), 86 The only evidence that I have found for attributing the book to Henshaw is an anonymous MS note in the copy of the *Miscellanea* in the British Museum But in an anonymous MS note in the copy in the Newberry Library the book is attributed to a "J Hall" The dates of these notes I have been unable to determine

## DONNE'S PARADOXES IN 1707

The extent to which Donne's writings were known during the later seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries is of interest to any serious student of his work. It may therefore be pertinent to list an instance of borrowing from him which has not (so far as I can discover) before been noted. John Dunton, founder of the "Athenian Society," published in 1707 a volume entitled *Athenian Sport or, Two Thousand Paradoxes Merrily Argued To Amuse and Dvert the Age*. Evidently by the time he reached page 92 of his book, Dunton's invention flagged, for in "Paradox xx That Inconstancy is a most commendable Virtue," after giving a few of his own lucubrations he suddenly began to transcribe verbatim and bodily Donne's paradox, "A Defence of Women's Inconstancy." He did so without embarrassment, since he made no acknowledgment whatever of his source or of his own lack of originality. Having discovered an easy way to add to "his" paradoxes, Dunton continued to steal from Donne, on pp 170, 307-8, 308-9, 314-15, 389-91, 395-6, 398-9, 399, 401, and 402-3. All of Donne's Paradoxes appear, with the significant exception of No xii, "That Virginitie is a Virtue."<sup>1</sup> Dunton makes occasional small changes in wording, but none worth special note.

One sure conclusion from the foregoing evidence has some importance: that Donne's *Paradoxes* could not have been at all commonly known to Englishmen in 1707, or Dunton would hardly have dared risk the charge of plagiarism by printing them as his own.

GEORGE REUBEN POTTER

*The University of California*

---

<sup>1</sup> "That Virginitie is a Virtue" was not included in the editions of 1633, but was in those of 1652. Dunton presumably used a copy dating from one or the other of those years, since no other printing is known before 1923, and his failure to use the paradox on virginitie makes it probable that he saw an edition of 1633, since there seems no particular reason why, if he had known that last paradox, he would have refrained from stealing it as he did all the others.

## RECENT WORKS ON PROSE FICTION BEFORE 1800

Ben Edwin Perry's "Early Greek Capacity for Viewing Things Separately" (*Trans Am Phil Asso*, lxxviii, 403) warns students and interpreters of folk-tales and ancient fictions to beware of leading into them an intention to express broad generalizations about life. The primitive mind, he maintains, did not feel obliged, as we do today, to find meaning or coherence beneath the surface of events, "it occupied itself with the object immediately before it rather than with anything more remote." On this theory, it is anachronistic to look in early fictions for much in the way of unity of action, consistency in characterization, or harmony of design — J. W. Knedler, Jr.'s "The Girl Without Hands" (*Abstr Haiv Diss.*, 1938) was undertaken to test the practical value of the Julius Krohn geographical-historical methods which the Folklore Fellows have approved. The results were on the whole favorable, although some weaknesses were found, especially the difficulty of determining by the Krohn methods which one of several versions of a tale is probably the earliest.

The study of Chinese fiction is made easier by means of three new works, — *Chinese Fairy Tales and Folk Tales*, collected and translated [~~into German~~] by Wolfram Eberhard (Kegan Paul), *Chinese Prose Literature of the T'ang Period* (A. D. 618-906) by E. D. Edwards, Reader in Chinese at the University of London (Probstham), the second volume of which illustrates the fiction of that time; and *The Golden Lotus* (Routledge), a translation by Clement Egerton of *Chin, Ping, Mei*. This novel was written in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, but the action takes place in the twelfth, during the Tartar invasion. It might be termed a Chinese *War and Peace*, for it covers all important aspects of domestic and national life. It is written in so frankly realistic a style that some of the passages have, for the sake of decorum, been rendered in Latin. The titular character, passionate, unprincipled, and voluble, reminds one of Petronius' Fortunata. A reading of *The Golden Lotus*, which is as Chinese as Hu-Kwa tea and as universal as water, should give pause to those historians who over-emphasize distinctions between national literatures or literary periods.

Several types of fiction prevalent during the earliest Christian times are studied in E. Basil Redlich's *Form Criticism* (Duckworth) and B. T. D. Smith's *Parables of the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambr. U). These works supplement, and at times correct, Dibelius' *From Tradition to Gospel* (cf. *MLN.*, l, 244). They

show, with respect to the apothegm-stories and parables of Jesus, what was particularly characteristic in his choice of subjects, and what was original in his way of unfolding the action and characterizing the persons. These are points of importance since no other fictions in world-literature have exercised a greater influence.

Philip H. Goepp's "Narrative Material of Apollonius of Tyre" (*ELH*, v, 150) finds that this story, which is the only extant example of prose fiction in Old English, is closely related to the Constance cycle and also to the main plot of Greene's *Pandosto Against Rohde*, and in agreement with Klebs, Goepp believes that the original version was not Greek but Latin, the work of a third-century sophist. The remarkably consistent style and purpose of the *Historia* he judges to be faithfully retained by the English translator.

About two hundred and fifty medieval narratives, mostly fictitious, are made conveniently available, in rather free translations, in John R. Reinhard's *Medieval Pageant*—M. Gaster (*TLS*, Sept 4, 1937) traces the legend of Virgil and the Bread to its sources, and Robert Eisler (*TLS*, Apr 18, 1938) finds the anecdote about Newton and the seashore pebbles in St Augustine—John J. Parry's "Geoffrey of Monmouth and the Paternity of Arthur" (*Spec*, xxi, 271) shows the medieval Defoe sedulous in making fictions look like true history, and pressing popularly accepted traditions into the service of rendering those fictions plausible—The historical facts which form the core of the largely fictitious Letters of *Héloise and Abélard* are well set forth in Enid McLeod's *Héloise* (Chatto & Windus).—The most important parts of John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* are translated in Joseph B. Pike's edition, *Frivolities of Courtiers and Footprints of Philosophers* (U of Minn.).

It is regrettable that Charles E. Kany's *Epistolary Novel in France, England, and Spain* (U. of California), a dissertation originally composed in 1920, was not published sooner. If it had been, Godfrey Singer's *Epistolary Novel* (cf. *MLN.*, xlv, 530) would probably have been an even better study than it is. Singer dealt with the letters in fictions of antiquity, but thence jumped into the sixteenth century with too slight consideration of what developments occurred during the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance. Kany's chief service is to fill that gap. He notes the use of letters in the fourteenth century by Machaut, Froissart, and Christine de Pisan, and in the fifteenth, by Aeneas Silvius, Diego de San Pedro, and Juan de Flores. From the sixteenth century onwards, and particularly after *l'Astrée* (1607-27), he finds their use rapidly increasing, and the ground thoroughly prepared for



the kinds of fictional letters,—satirical, frivolous, sentimental, and psychological,—which were to flourish after 1700. A study harmonizing the results of Kany and Singer is a *desideratum*.

Boccaccio is commonly regarded as a man's author, but paradoxically we now have from a woman, Catherine Carswell, the wisest and delightfulest biography yet written upon him, *The Tranquil Heart* (Lawrence and Wishart).—Friedrich Brie's "Französischer Frühhumanismus in England" (*Anglia*, xlix, 152) studies new methods and standards in histories and pseudo-histories, such as *Faits des Romains*, well known on both sides of the Channel.—On jest-books, there is "English Humour 1500-1800" (*TLS*, May 21, 1938), reviewing the Bodleian Library exhibition of *facetiae*.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY.—We have several new and admirable editions. *Valentine and Orson* is excellently done for the EETS by Arthur Dickson, whose fine monograph of 1929 on the French original and its sources should be used in connection with this text. For the first time since the days of Wynkyn de Worde, the complete version (including the entire second edition and the fragment of the first) is now generally accessible, and everything desirable in the way of variants, glossary, and footnotes has been thoroughly supplied.—Scholarly too is Philip E. Hallett's edition (Burns & Oates) of Ralph Robinson's translation of More's *Utopia*, "the first Catholic edition in modern times," with a judicious foreword by Lord Russell of Killowen.—The Oxford University Press, in cooperation with MLA, presents *A Petite Pallace of Pettre His Pleasure*, based on the Britwell copy, with variants from six other versions, and edited by Herbert W. Hartman, Jr. This should supplant the not quite satisfactory Gollancz edition.—For wealthy bibliophiles there is a magnificent *Daphnis and Chloe* in George Thornley's beautiful translation, with woodcuts by a distinguished French sculptor (Zwemmer).—A new rendering of Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, more accurate than that of 1764, is furnished by Warren E. Blake (U of Mich Press).—Anthony Blunt shows the influence upon literature and the arts, of *Hyperotomachia Poliphili* (*Journ. Warburg Inst.*, 1).—Harry Ross's *Utopias Old and New* (Nicholson & Watson) gives outlines of many such accounts from Plato to modern times, including those of More, Campanella, and Harrington, accompanying the summaries with incisive and dogmatic comments on the social and political ideas the various authors held.

There is little or nothing of value to literary scholarship in Alfred H. Bill's *Astrophel, or the Life and Death of the Renowned*

*Sir Philip Sidney* (Cassell).—Kenneth T Rowe (*PMLA*, liv, 122) ably defends the Countess of Pembroke against charges of tampering with the *Arcadia* and Bowdlerizing it, he thinks her an honest editor, though careless, and believes she was in possession of a manuscript which had been revised by her brother—Beatrice D Brown's "Marlowe, Faustus, and Simon Magus" and Alpad Steiner's "Faust Legend and the Christian Tradition" (*PMLA*, liv, 82, 391) explore the rich medieval antecedents of that legend, Steiner insisting that the hostile attitude towards intemperate searching after truth is not specifically Lutheran, as has been maintained, but had been part of Christian dogma from the beginning.

René Pruvost, a disciple of Émile Legouis, in *Robert Greene et ses romans* (Les Belles Lettres) exemplifies the best traditions of French scholarship and gives us the first authoritative monograph on this subject. Both the personality of Greene and his prose fictions are rich in apparent contradictions or ambiguities, and contemporaneous judgments upon him, as well as modern ones, have been highly confusing and unconvincing. Pruvost skillfully steers a middle course between the violent condemnation of Greene by Harvey and other Elizabethans, and the sentimental admiration of Brydges and Grosart. Undeniably this author, who moralized overmuch in his writings, forsook his wife and lived in debauchery. He was not guiltless, but neither was he totally insincere. Typical product of both the Renaissance and the Reformation, he vacillated between reckless indulgence and genuine remorse. The inconsistencies are reflected in his works. From the classical revival he took, not high intellectual seriousness, but its least noble traits. In the legends of the gods of Greece, he saw mainly the erotic or fantastic features, for true history or geography he had no sense; too often he indulged in romanesque themes, facile and shallow characterization, and rhetorical edification. But he had at least one essential quality of the novelist,—he could captivate the attention of his reader. The parts of his tales were rarely original, but his manner of composing them into a whole frequently was so. In *Morando*, *Farewell to Women*, and elsewhere he created interest by depicting women who, in their relations towards fathers, lovers, and husbands exhibited a noteworthy degree of independence and frankness (and this adumbrated a characteristic of the world of Shakespeare). And in the story of the Duke Valdracko in *Planeto-machia* he left a tragic tale of the highest class. This study is richly documented. Among the valuable appendices is found "Jupiter's Tragedy," which Grosart omitted from his edition. The

fanciful and vagabond mind of Greene would, I think, have been delighted could he have foreseen that in the course of time the best appreciation of his work would be composed in romantic Algiers, where its author is stationed

Samuel C. Chew's *The Crescent and the Rose* (Oxford U. Pr.) considers fictitious elements, as well as true ones, in travelers' tales from Hakluyt to Purchas.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY—The *Critical Bibliography of Editions of Don Quixote* to 1917 (Harv. U. Pr.), compiled by Benages and Fonbuene, was continued to 1937 by the former before his recent death, and has been edited by J. D. M. Ford and C. T. Keller (Harv. U. Pr.)—Mrs. Helen P. Houck (*PMLA.*, liv, 422) shows that Mabbe, in his English translations of the *Celestina* was untrue to the spirit and style of the original and consistently suppressed the religious passages—Grant McColley gives us a good edition of Godwin's *Man in the Moone* (Smith Coll. Studies), and in the *Bibliographical Society Transactions* (1937, p. 472) discusses the third edition thereof—J. P. Camus' novel *Iphigène*, and its relations to Polish history, are set forth by Julius Krzyzanowski and Fletcher Henderson (*TLS*, Apr. 9, 1938, Feb. 4, 1939).—Dorothy McDougall presents a detailed and judicious biography of Madeleine de Scudéry (Methuen), and Spire Pitou, Jr., a thorough study of the sources, structure, and reputation of La Calpiègnede's *Faramond* (Johns Hopkins Pr.)

Jack Lindsay's *John Bunyan: Maker of Myths* (Methuen) is sprightly in style and not without some substantial merits,—such as the disclosure of the important place which the story of Esau selling his birthright played in the seventeenth-century controversies. But to anyone historically minded this will prove an exasperating book. Its point of view is indicated in this sentence: "When Bunyan constructed his system of grace, he devised an ideology closely related to the social processes in which he and his class, the dispossessed peasantry on the edge of the petty-bourgeois, were involved" (p. 112). To Lindsay, the decisive factor in Bunyan's life was his so-called "proletarian" and "pre-industrialist" status, his religious beliefs and dreams were relatively unimportant derivatives of his economic and social status. One would enjoy hearing Bunyan, a master of invective, comment on that assertion,—provided he could be made to understand it, which is doubtful. Lindsay ignores the researches of Harold Golder and W. Y. Tindall (cf. *MLN.*, li, 248), and is therefore insufficiently equipped to discuss Bunyan's reading. He is convinced that he has revealed to us a

new Bunyan, but in my opinion he has merely shown what Bunyan might have become could he have read Karl Marx —F Mott Harrison, on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of Bunyan's death, gave his fine collection of Bunyaniana to the Bedford Public Library, which has issued an illustrated catalogue of the more than eight hundred items

EIGHTEENTH CENTURY —Kenneth C Slagle's *English Country Squire as Depicted in English Prose Fiction from 1740 to 1800* (Diss U Penn), examining six-score of novels, finds that most of them agreed as to the character, opinions, and manner of life of the typical squire. A minority was chiefly concerned with representing him as decadent in comparison with his robust seventeenth-century predecessor. But the majority, and this included nearly all the novelists still read to-day, were more interested in his relation to the contemporaneous than to the past. The composite portrait was not a flattering one. The squire did not appear as an exemplar of the beneficial effects of country life. He was "morally and emotionally unstable, unintelligent, reactionary, striving to stem or divert the natural course of progress." The causes of this hostility, Dr Slagle believes, lay partly in a growing revolt of the urban middle-class against the snobbishness of the squirearchy, and partly in the development of radical social theories. This is a useful survey and on the whole a reliable one, although there are indications that the author has not always taken care to use the best editions of the works considered. Slagle burkes the interesting question to what degree the novelists' depiction of the squire is accurate and just, and there is, therefore, still room for a study which shall test the historical value of the fictional accounts by comparing them with true records.

Rosamond Bayne-Powell's *English Child in the Eighteenth Century* (John Murray), delightfully written and charmingly illustrated, has two chapters here pertinent,—"Children's Books" and "Some Children in Eighteenth Century Fiction." Mrs Powell finds Miss Edgeworth's tales incomparably the best in their day, and speaks some words in defence or extenuation of the nursery pabulum, so abhorrent to Charles Lamb, prepared by Mrs. Barbauld. A parade of fictitious children is reviewed,—"Colonel" Jack, little Tom Jones, Humphrey Clunker and Roderick Random, David Simple, Moses Primrose, etc. No general conclusions are drawn, but the impression is given that Sarah Fielding's Camilla was justified in sarcastically declaring that it was "the method of most wise parents to use their little ones as if they were laying plots to secure their hearty aversion to the end of their lives."

Two bibliographical compilations have appeared, neither of them entirely satisfactory. The larger in scope is Andrew Block's *The English Novel, 1740-1850: a Catalogue including Prose Romances, Short Stories, and Translations of Foreign Fictions* (Grafton). It seems clear that this huge ingathering depends not upon a direct examination of the thousands of books that are listed but largely upon second-hand sources of information often imperfect. Some of the many errors in dates, titles, attribution, etc. are given in *TLS*, Mch 25, 1939. It is impossible to discern on what principles some items were included and others of the same kind omitted. — Much less extensive, and better done, is Harold W. Streeter's *Eighteenth Century English Novel in French Translation: a Bibliographical Study* (Inst of French Studies). This lists over five hundred titles, arranged by various genres or groups. Some of the mistakes are corrected by Donald F. Bond in a valuable review of this work (*MP*, xxxv, 457). Though Streeter's subtitle suggests that he regards his bibliographical contribution relatively the more important, his lengthy introductory interpretation is a useful outline of the movement. It does not exaggerate the effect of the English novel upon the French, and rightly regards Prévost as a greater influence than Richardson.

The first volume, *A Tale of a Tub*, in Herbert Davis's projected *Shakespeare Head Swift* (Blackwell), is textually not so important as the later volumes are likely to be, because in this exceptional instance a sound edition (Guthkelch and Nichol Smith) has been available. The aim is "to provide a text of the works giving, not the earliest form of the written manuscript or first printed edition, but the final corrected and revised versions which appeared during Swift's lifetime." The editor has enjoyed the assistance of Harold Williams, expert in this difficult field (cf. the account of his library, *TLS*, Aug 27, 1939). The great need is an edition of *Gulliver's Travels*, conformable with what has been recently discovered concerning the final authorized text, and that is to be the eleventh volume of the Shakespeare Head edition — W. F. Trench and K. B. Garratt discuss Swift marginalia found in copies of Macky's *Memoirs* (*Library*, xix). — D. E. Baughan argues that an enthusiastic passage in Sidney's *Defence of Poesie* about the nobility of horses may have helped to inspire the idea of the Houyhnhnms (*ELS*, v, 207). — Edith Sitwell's *I Live Under A Black Sun* (Gollancz), and Lewis Gibb's *Vanessa and the Dean* (Dent), are novels, but each is so serious an attempt to interpret Swift's life and character that they deserve the attention of scholars.

Richard Steele's *Spectator* story of the Indian maiden whose

ungrateful English lover sold her into slavery was popular during a century in England, Germany, and France, and gave issue to many prose fictions, poems, and plays. The chief of these have been collected and discussed by Lawrence M. Price in an *Inkle and Yarico Album* (U. of California).

A closer study of Defoe's political and economic ideas is facilitated by the Facsimile Text Society's monumental reproduction in twenty-two volumes of *The Review*, thoroughly edited by A. W. Secord—John R. Moore's *Defoe in the Pillory, and Other Studies* (Indiana U.) sheds light on both biographical and literary problems. Defoe's humiliating sentence to the pillory is shown to have been owing to the personal grudge his judges bore him. New sources for works known to be by Defoe are pointed out,—e.g., for *Roxana*, but more important is the clarification of Defoe's relationship (sometimes left vague by Dottin) to narratives hitherto only hesitatingly associated with his name. Moore concerns himself in such cases both with the sources of the problematic narratives and with their style and ideas, he arrives at definite conclusions about the authorship, and, as a rule, these seem acceptable. About one-sixth of the *Voyage of Don Manuel Gonzales* appears to have been originally from Defoe's hand. To him must be ascribed *Robert Drury's Journal*, "in style, in method, and in ideas a characteristic romance of the author of *Robinson Crusoe*" (p. 104). (In this case, more detailed accounts of the sources and comparison of them with the *Journal* would have been welcome.) Most important of all, to Defoe should be credited that *General History of Pirates*, nominally by the mythical "Charles Johnson," which was to prove very influential upon many historians and biographers, and which was the delight of several great story-tellers, including Scott and Stevenson, who did not know by whom it was written. Moore finds that, although it is in the main fairly reliable history, Defoe intensified its interest by inserting imaginary speeches, dialogues, reflections, and incidents, which his supposed informants could hardly have succeeded in learning or witnessing. To Defoe, who is shown to have been an authority on Juan Fernandez three-and-a-half years before Selkirk returned therefrom, the *History of the Pirates* was the culmination of a lifelong interest in those who go down to the sea in ships—Dr. Philip Gosse's great collection of pirate-literature (described in *TLS*, Dec. 3, 1938) has been given to the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich.

Henry C. Fisher's *Realism and Morality in English Fiction Before 1750* (U. Pittsburgh Diss.) maintains that Fielding's "moralism" was more largely traditional than Richardson's.—

Paul Hazard's "Un Romantique de 1730 · l'Abbé Prévost," a contribution to the Harvard Tercentary symposium, *Authority and the Individual*, is a brilliant summary of pre-romantic characteristics which should prove widely useful — R. B. Mowat's *Jean Jacques Rousseau* is exceptionally judicious in his attitude towards his author's character and works. James H. Wainer, in a praiseworthy article (*PMLA*, li, 803) shows that although the English translation of the *Nouvelle Héloïse* was inferior to the original, the reception of that novel in England was on the whole, and with reservations, predominantly favorable. Students of Rousseau's ideas should not overlook *The Development of Political Theory* (Allen and Unwin) by the distinguished scholar Otto von Guericke, which traces some of Rousseau's principles back to Althusius — Eugène E. Royallan (*PMLA*, li, 374), armed with a battery of quotations from Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, etc., argues that many of the ideas in Voltaire's *Zadig* are derived from the Stoical tradition.

George M. Kahrl (Abst. Harv. Diss., 1938) studies the influence upon Smollett of his reading travel-books, and of his own travels, and finds that they gave his works "autobiographical foundation, emphasis on comparative manners, objective point of view," etc. — In Charles Johnstone's *Chrysal, or, the Adventures of a Guinea*, we have the chief contemporary account of the notorious Medmenham Abbey. A serious attempt to ascertain the true facts about the matter is made in Ronald Fuller's *Hell-Fire Francis* (Chatto & Windus), but the author admits that it is almost impossible to solve the problem. — The first thorough study of Frances Sheridan is made by Samuel P. Chew, Jr. (Abst. Harv. Diss., 1938). He finds her *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidolph* related to the writings of Prévost, Riccoboni, and Baculard d'Arnaud (Prévost translated the *Memoirs*). — John Carter describes two American collections of Beckfordiana (*Colophon*, new ser., i), and Bertha C. Slade presents in *Maria Edgeworth: a Bibliographical Tribute* a work of basic value for her author's life as well as for her writings. Robert G. Mood, Jr., in *Maria Edgeworth's Apprenticeship* (Abst. U. of Ill., 1938) pays especial attention to her reading and the influence of her father upon her. — M. Ray Adams' "Helen Maria Williams and the French Revolution" (*Wordsworth and Coleridge*, Princeton U. Pr.) places Miss Williams, who wrote the tale on which *The Lady of Lyons* was based, in as favorable a light as is justly possible. *Four New Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft and Helen Maria Williams* (written during the Reign of Terror) are edited by B. P. Kurtz and C. C. Autrey (U. of California Pr.).

Robert B. Heilman's *America In English Fiction, 1760-1800* (U. Penn. Pr.) deals with about seventy-five novels. Few of these are known today,—Pratt's *Emma Cobbett*, Charlotte Smith's *Old Manor House* and *Celestina*, Pye's *Democrat*, perhaps, but none of the others. A few of the resurrected ones Heilman finds readable, e.g., *Jonathan Corncob* (1787) and *Berkeley Hall* (1796), but most of them lacked literary value. Some of these brought in the Revolution merely because it was of contemporaneous interest (a Mrs. Parsons' *Voluntary Exile*, in five volumes, "did the war in detail from beginning to end"), others took a critical attitude towards it, and still others really endeavored to estimate the character of American life. The style of this monograph is clumsy and labored, and the method shows a prosaic penchant for statistics. Nevertheless certain results of genuine value are gained. Heilman demonstrates that these works illustrate the beginnings of a middle phase between the Renaissance concept of America as the Promised Land and the ultra-modern concept of it as the scene of mankind's worst failure. The democratic principles of the revolutionaries are admired, and, although the hardships of frontier life are by this time too well known to be ignored, the new world is still presented as a land of opportunity from the standpoint not only of economics but also of civilization. This qualified hopefulness does not preclude, in some of the novelists, satirical portrayal of the cruder American types and manners.—A welcome reproduction of an early American novel is the Facsimile Text Society's of Mrs. Foster's *The Coquette* (1797), edited by Herbert R. Brown.

Miss J. M. S. Tompkins' *The Polite Marriage* (Macmillan) is not a collection of essays on neglected authors without any unifying principle: each of these minor writers shows an unusual personality, as well as an aspect of the taste of his day. Among them are Richard and Elizabeth Griffith, whose love-letters before and after marriage were published by themselves as *Letters Between Henry and Frances* to show forth their belief that the constant exercise of "tenderness and politeness" towards one another will "refine Matrimony into Amour." There are also the Bristol Milkwoman, Ann Yearsley, of whom Southey wrote respectfully, with her romance *The Royal Captives, or the Man in the Iron Mask*, and the author (perhaps the draughtsman, John Carter) of *The Scotch Parents*, an autobiographic tale of a low-class love-affair. That strange but true "original," James White, learned but ill-fated, is here, with his historical romances that incongruously mix sound



learning, eloquence, and sarcasm. Finally we have Mary Hays, the female philosopher and persistent man-hunter, who in *Emma Courtney* justified amorous passion on the ground of its "social utility," and in *Victim of Prejudice* protested against the injustice of society in punishing "an involuntary lapse from chastity." These studies are in most cases the first, and in all cases the best, on their subjects, and throughout they are marked by that Austenish grace and sense of humor which made Miss Tompkins' *Popular Novel* so delightful (cf. *MLN*, xlviii, 377).

Montague Summers' *The Gothic Quest* (Fortune P1) is the first part of what is to be a history of the "Gothic Novel" in two or more volumes. Its author has for decades been a collector and reader of tales of terror, and gives us much first-hand information concerning their substance and the circumstances of their publication, which is especially valuable with respect to those fictions of which only a few copies are extant. Another substantial merit is the frequent use of contemporaneous criticisms of the novels. A quarter of this volume is devoted to M. G. Lewis (for collections in that section, see Michael Sadleir, *TLS*, Jan. 7, 1939). Preceding that we have a discussion of romanticism, an account of publishers and circulating libraries, and a survey of the main French and German influences. On matters of fact Summers will be consulted, often with profit, but in matters of historical and critical interpretation, he is often unsatisfactory. In one place he explains at great length that romanticism, of which the Gothic novel is an issue, is supernaturalism, and in its best form mysticism. Yet elsewhere he regards the genre as escape-literature, which he defends as freeing us from "carking cares of a bitter actuality." His judgment is often warped by eccentric notions or prejudices: authors who portray Catholic institutions as possibly admitting occasional evils are necessarily wrong, werewolves are actual creatures, of which it is "literally true" that they emit a stench, Mrs. Nesta Williams' *World Revolution* is credible history, etc., etc. He is ignorant of some important scholarly works in the field, writes about Prévost without having consulted J. R. Foster, and vainly tries to distinguish between seventeenth-century historical fiction and later kinds without knowing Gerhard Buck's differentiation between "historisierende Romane" and "historische" (cf. *MLN*, xlvii, 112). His attitude towards his predecessors,—Railo, Brauchli, Miss Tompkins, etc.—is habitually ungrateful and contemptuous. They may, however, console themselves by observing that in Summers' opinion Coleridge, too, does not know the truth as it is given to M. S. to know it.

Walter F. Wright's *Sensibility in English Prose Fiction 1760-1814* (U. of Ill.) bears the subtitle *A Reinterpretation*. The author does not pretend to have discovered important new materials, nor does he disagree with the commonly accepted belief that during the period he treats the novel tended to become increasingly sentimental or romantic. The questions he raises concern the causes for this development. Was the change chiefly due to social or economic forces? Is it sufficiently explained by saying that from time to time novelists turned to new materials which in themselves were romantic? To such questions his answer is No. To him the process is the gradual development of a spirit or temper. It is less a matter of the logical history of thought than of the natural history of feeling. As we proceed from decade to decade, we find that the earlier novels depict, cultivate, and satisfy the gentle emotions, that the craving for stronger and deeper ones gradually arises, until in the end the most violent and tragic passions are demanded. Wright shows this emotional ascent affecting the novelists' choice of subjects, tone of treatment, admiration for some types of men and women and contempt for others, and ultimately their views as to what human life was and what it should be. If they professed a philosophy, it was often the rationalization of instinctive feelings. Out of this method of approach, there arise, it seems to me, many new and sound distinctions between such novelists as Walpole, Mrs. Radcliffe, Lewis, Beckford, and Maturin. Wright's work represents a reaction towards the school of taste, and is not merely a history but also an essay in creative criticism.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

*University of Illinois*

## REVIEWS

*Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung System und Methodenlehre der Literaturwissenschaft, I Werk und Dichter.* Von JULIUS PETERSEN. Berlin Junker und Dunnhaupt Verlag, 1939. Pp. xvi, 516

Petersen's book is, as its title indicates, a treatise on methods. We might conceive the task of writing such a book in various ways (1) a description of a single acceptable method as we might have a "Methodenlehre der qualitativen Untersuchung der Metalle"; (2) a description of several conceivable methods with an examination of

their advantages and disadvantages, (3) a review of what has been done in solving particular problems at various times or by various scholars and the consequent disclosure of the methods by implication rather than by direct statement. As I have already hinted the first variety of a methodology is found more frequently in the natural sciences rather than in literary history. We should seek to answer the question: "What elements of such a handbook would be useful to the student of literary history?" Such a handbook has at least two elements which are easily obscured in a treatise of the second or third sort, viz, it will ordinarily state the problem clearly and succinctly as a problem which calls for a solution and it will ordinarily name the tools and the procedures to be used. In the field of the methodology of literary history André Morize's *Problems and Methods of Literary History with special reference to modern French Literature*, Boston, 1922, is a conspicuously successful example of a textbook of this first variety. On the whole, Petersen's book represents a combination of the second and third varieties. For example, he describes (pp. 303-6) three ways of stating the facts of a poet's life and suggests the advantages and disadvantages which attach to each of them. In the immediately following section (pp. 306-8), he follows the pragmatic plan of the third variety of methodology and reviews what has been accomplished in discovering the facts of a poet's life. He does not state the possible ways of discovering these facts and then weigh their relative values. Here and there, the description and evaluation of methods might have been sharper and more positive. Thus, for example, the section "Traumleben" (pp. 394-400) recites a number of facts from the theorizing of Romanticists regarding dreams and the experiences of such poets as Hebbel, Chatterton, Tolstoi, Goethe, and many another, but the section leaves me rather uncertain as to what I, as a historian of literature, might do with any particular dream or poet. On the other hand, I shall not call for bald and uninspired as well as uninspiring statistics of the human spirit, and Petersen wisely warns us against that danger (pp. 341, 401).

Petersen has collected an amazing number of illustrations from the literary history of Europe since the Reformation. His learning does not stop or even linger momentarily at the boundaries of Germany. Without the slightest apparent hesitation he selects an illustration from Elizabethan England, Germany at the time of rationalism, Germany in the period of romanticism, or from Goethe. French literature is perhaps not mentioned as frequently as English literature, but the deficiency, if we could even call it a deficiency, is more than balanced by the abundance of references to French writers on the theory of literary history. Petersen's book can teach us much. It is not to be read hastily, for its values will appear most abundantly when the reader has made an outline of the text, has rearranged the materials for his own purposes, and has added to

them from his own store. I suggest these steps not to imply that the reader should try to improve upon Petersen's arrangement but to make clear that the lessons which he would teach can only be learned by hard work and systematic analysis.

Petersen deals but briefly with the scholarly tools and might have dealt with them even more briefly. A systematic use of R. F. Arnold's *Allgemeine Bucherkunde zur neueren deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, 3d edition, Berlin, 1931, might have supplied helpful references now and again, and other standard works of reference might have been introduced upon occasion. Thus, for example, the bibliography of lists of incunabula (pp. 469-70, note on p. 69) might have been replaced by references to Georg Schneider, *Handbuch der Bibliographie*<sup>1</sup> or Fritz Milkau, *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft*,<sup>2</sup> the catalogue of "Anonymen-Lexika" (p. 474) by Arnold, pp. 203-4, 214 and Schneider, pp. 449-67, the references on the history of various foreign metrical forms (p. 493, note on p. 246) by the citing of pertinent sections in Andreas Heusler, *Deutsche Versgeschichte*<sup>3</sup> and articles in the *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*. These three bibliographical notes form only a negligible portion of Petersen's book, and that fact is significant. My mention of them is to show what Petersen intended or rather what he did not intend to do. Specifically, he did not intend to supply the student with a collection of tools systematically arranged for use. He wished to discuss the methods and not the practice of literary history.

ARCHER TAYLOR

*University of California*

---

*Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal* Erschienen bei  
GEORG BONDI, Berlin [1939] Pp. 262

A publication of unusual importance, these letters exchanged between Stefan George und Hugo von Hofmannsthal between the years 1891 and 1906, not only because they are the first intimately biographical document from the pen of George to appear, but because they give us in spite of their laconism a considerable insight into the literary struggle of the time, into the personal and pathetic struggle of two men who admire, revere each other's works and have no approach to each other's personality. Painful letters, perhaps the most tactless letters two great poets ever exchanged, and yet letters which fill us with respect for their ever renewed attempt to find a way to each other for the sake of their mission in the renaissance of German lyricism.

<sup>1</sup> 4th ed., Berlin, 1930, pp. 85-103

<sup>2</sup> Leipzig, 1931, I, 413-16, § 154

<sup>3</sup> "Grundriss der germanischen Philologie," 3d ed., VIII, 1-3, Berlin, 1925 29.

The book begins with foreboding verses of Hofmannsthal to "Herrn Stefan George, einem der vorübergeht" and the characteristic questioning of George's "bleibe ich für Sie nichts mehr als einer der vorübergeht?" It ends with a somewhat petulant request of Hofmannsthal that George restore to him the right of free disposition over his small collection of lyrics privately printed and the cutting reply of George reminding the other of the words of their contract. Throughout the book George, the older, with an unrelenting will to gather around him men of lyrical promise and to set up a literary dictatorship, to educate the younger poets to the consciousness of their sacred mission, to force an exemplary production, woos the younger man in whom he sees real genius, the only genius, perhaps, beside himself. Hofmannsthal, with greater psychological insight, bound by ties of family, of friendship, rooted in Austrian life, broader in sympathies, tolerant of non-literary aspirations, hedges, retreats, evades, temporizes, leaves to "Tyche" and time what absolute will seeks to force. He yields to mood, place, and season, to influence of tradition and men, he is the humble vessel of his God but does not command his muse, he mislays his manuscripts and shrinks from a pretentious printing, he vacillates between deepest discouragement and highest exultation in his craft.

George knows only one task "He who belongs to no art, may he claim at all to belong to life? How? At best in barbarian times." Whenever Hofmannsthal yields to George's wooing, the latter takes him to task, for his Austrian attachments, which he abhors, for his compromising with lower literary currents, which he loathes, even for unprecise syntactical expression of which he disapproves. George's grotesque tactlessness is impersonal, dictatorial, issues from the postulates of his ideals. Yet he can find touching words of encouragement when Hofmannsthal is seized by melancholy. Hofmannsthal's tactlessness is reaction, resentment against intrusion, issues from a desire to defend his own personal life and emotions. Thus he often seems weakest when we sympathize with him most strongly.

Their paths separate when Hofmannsthal turns to the stage, which George despises. For how could he whose strength is the monologue and whose way and voice are ever his own, recognize the dialectics of tragic dilemma. Hofmannsthal's Protean genius fills the soul of every one of his figures. Yet, Hofmannsthal's last hero, the Prince in his *Turm*, uncompromising as George before the dictatorship of brute force, dies like the latter in tragic solitude, for "Eitel ist alles außer der Rede zwischen Geist und Geist" (*Der Turm*).

Thanks are due to the publisher for his unsparing art of book craft, to the editor, Mr. Robert Boehringer, for his careful, discrete, and instructive annotation.

ERNST FEISE

Giovanni Boccaccio *Il Filocolo*. A cura di SALVATORE BATTAGLIA.  
Bari · Laterza, 1938. Pp 600 Lire 60

Giovanni Boccaccio *Le Rime. L'Amorosa Visione. La Caccia di  
Diana* A cura di VITTORE BRANCA Bari Laterza, 1939.  
Pp 407. Lire 35 (*Scrittori d'Italia*, nn 167, 169).

Owing both to a program of some years' standing on the part of the Crusca Academy, and to the now happily revised program of publication of the *Scrittori d'Italia* series under the competent direction of Luigi Russo, the works of Giovanni Boccaccio will soon stand complete in new editions far more satisfactory than the century-old Moutier *Opere complete* which has done long service to scholars, but a dubious service in the light of the versions which renewed critical effort is now bringing to print.

First in appearance has been the volume of the Laterza series edited by Vincenzo Pernicone · *Il Filostrato e il Ninfale Fiesolano*. This was followed by a monumental and definitive edition of the *Teseida*, the careful and long-expected work of Salvatore Battaglia, who was able to profit by the discovery and proof, of Vandell, that the Laurentian ms containing the work with lengthy glosses is all in the hand of Boccaccio himself. This critical edition has appeared as the second volume in the series contemplated by the Crusca (Sansoni, Florence) with full critical apparatus, discussion of language and style, with glossary. The Crusca editions are the goal of all the new editorial work, which in these other cases has given a tentative statement of its various progress in the *Scrittori d'Italia* volumes

Outside the scope of the present review, these two volumes which have already received adequate treatment elsewhere, are doubtless those of most immediate interest to Chaucer scholars. It may be that, on the basis of recorded variants, it will be possible for such scholars to determine more closely to which particular family of the manuscripts of each work belonged those which served Chaucer as sources. Such a possibility is indeed claimed by Pernicone for the *Filostrato* (p. 373, n. 1); and such a determination might lead to a precision of date of some factual consequences in the inter-relations of the two writers

Next in order in the *Scrittori d'Italia* series will be the *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta* already announced, and before many years pass, no doubt, the remaining minor works will appear, as well as a more satisfactory edition of the *Decameron* than the present two volumes of the series contain as edited over ten years ago by A. F. Massera (which, in spite of shortcomings easily discernible, still remains the best available text).

Neither of the volumes before us is claimed as a definitive critical text by its editor. Both, judging from remarks in the notes,

represent that stage mentioned above as progress toward the status of definitive Crusca texts

For the present text of the *Filocolo*, Battaglia has limited his collation to manuscripts in Florence and Rome, all of which happen to be of the fifteenth century, ten in number, with no autograph involved. In spite of the practical limitations thus imposed on the text, even a hasty check with the Moutier and the De Ferri editions (the latter Torino, 1927), aided by passages quoted to this purpose (p. 571 ff.), shows the strangely contaminated version of those editions, now happily corrected in a host of important passages. In fact, there is not a page that in some way or other does not clearly improve its reading.

Sig. Battaglia, now well-known for a number of important Boccaccio studies, has not left out of the picture his own sense of the literary value of the work he has spent so much time on. His final *nota* is extended to a brief critical estimate of the *Filocolo* which may rightfully figure in the history of criticism of that work (pp. 581 ff.) and as an extension of his acute remarks which appeared in the *Archivum Romanicum* (vol XIX, 1935). A useful feature of his volume, not appearing in former editions of the work, is the Index of names mentioned, good reminder of the range of multiple digressions and surprising flight of fancy which surrounds this once simple story of Florio and *Biancofiore* in the garb it acquired at the youthful hands of Boccaccio.

A very few, probably insignificant, errors have crept into this lengthy text: s'oddormentano (s'addormentano) p. 120, io mio piango (io mi piango) p. 207, nostri (vostri) p. 336, d'anni (danni) p. 422, petesse (potesse) p. 500, già e (è) cotanto p. 551.

Two of the three texts which make up the volume edited by Vittore Branca, the *Rime* and the *Caccia di Diana*, had already been published in what was claimed as a definitive version by Massera. Branca now demonstrates that both of the Massera versions could be improved. Boccaccio's *Rime* are a thorny problem. No collection of them in the hand of the author is extant and their dispersion has very nearly created a separate critical problem for each single composition, the tentative statement of which problem appears in Branca's *Nota*. He has had, moreover, the good judgment to print here those compositions of doubtful authenticity, but of literary merit equal to those of certain attribution, which Massera had excluded. These are, of course, strictly recognized as questionably Boccaccio's. Added to these individual problems is the comprehensive one of arrangement, which in the absence of Boccaccio's expressed desire, will remain a tempting if idle problem. Recognizing the absolute lack of any criterion for this arrangement, Branca has kept that order given to the *Rime* by Massera, all the while questioning the biographical norm which he allowed to guide him.

As with the *Rime*, the text of the *Amorosa Visione* is here given as a *primo passo* toward the definitive one

The recently renewed attempt to prove the *Caccia* to be the earliest work of Boccaccio is represented by an article by Branca himself which preceded this edition (*Annali della R. Scuola Normale di Pisa*, 1939, pp. 278 ff). However questionable the ultimate proof of such authorship may be (and Branca has given some very good reasons for not doubting it) the text of that work is welcome in this volume on its way, like its companions, to final critical form.

That final form will doubtless exclude a number of useless archaic survivals which have been allowed to stand in this volume, such as *tengho*, *chui*, *senpre*, etc. Nor is it plain why initial *h* should be allowed to live its questionable life in *hardito*, *honesta*, *habituati*, *horribili*, *humiliati* and *humile* alongside *onorandola*, *ò* (*ho*), *orribil*, and *onesto*. The various forms of *atere* might well be made uniform (eliminating *a'tar*, *Rime* LXXXIX, 5 and *passum* beside *atando*, p. 271, and *atate*, p. 211).

Since many years may be required for the publication of genuine critical editions of the works of Boccaccio which may stand with as much certainty as the *Teseida* now does, the continued publication of such tentative texts in this handsome series cannot fail to meet with a general welcome

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

*Comicall Satyre and Shakespeare's "Troilus and Cressida."* By OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL. San Marino Huntington Library, 1938. Pp. x + 246 \$3.00.

The plays particularly considered in Professor Campbell's learned and original book are three by the young Ben Jonson, several by Marston, and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida*,—all dating between 1599 and the death of Elizabeth in 1603. The initial thesis is that these were written "to circumvent a legal prohibition," i. e., the order of June 1, 1599 that "no Satires or Epigrams be printed hereafter." Roughly stated, then, Mr. Campbell's argument is that Jonson in *Every Man out of his Humour* invented a new species of drama, which he termed "Comicall Satyre," for the purpose of bootlegging an equivalent of the proscribed satires and epigrams, and that the laws of this strange hybrid explain the peculiarities of *Troilus and Cressida* no less than those of *Cynthia's Revels*, *Poetaster*, *Antonio and Melinda*, *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, and *What You Will*.

These are all, by the usual standards, rather amorphous plays, and Mr. Campbell has offered valuable clues to their elucidation.



He has devised a very definite formula for their structure and applied it with severity. The formula seems to me to fit best with the earliest play, *Every Man Out*, much less well with *Poetaster*, and least of all with *Troilus and Cressida*, which in accordance with it is defined as "the adventures of two virtuos<sup>1</sup> in sensuality." But on this play critics always differ, and Mr. Campbell has so generously analyzed my opinion in the matter that he will hardly expect my immediate adhesion to his.

If "Comical Satyre" was recognized as a distinct type of drama in the opening years of the seventeenth century, I do not think its *raison d'être* can be safely found in the perishing of regular non-dramatic satire from the earth. The statement on p. 3 of the present book is "After 1599 formal satire practically ceased to be written until 1613." Samuel Rowlands seems to have had no notion of this in 1600, when he wrote his epigram to the practicing poets of the day, exhorting them to more and harsher satire:

Good honest Poets, let me crave a boon,  
That you would write, I do not care how soon,  
Against the bastard humours hourly bred  
In every mad-brain'd, wit-worn, giddy head  
At such gross follies do not sit and wink,  
Belabour these same gulls with pen and ink!

Rowlands goes on to urge the poets specifically *not* to write for the stage, which he still associates with love, not satire. The history of the book of stinging satires, at the head of which the above epigram appeared, is interesting. It was regularly entered at Stationers' Hall with Mr. Pasfield's license on October 16, 1600, something over a year after the Archbishop and Bishop of London had proclaimed their anathema. A fortnight later (Oct. 29) restraint won a Pyrrhic victory, and it was condemned to be burned. The next year and the year after that stationers were being fined (two-and-sixpence apiece) for purchasing new editions of it. In all, twenty-nine booksellers were fined, and at least five editions, issued between 1600 and 1613, are still extant, including the original 'burnt' one in as many copies as generally survive of such a book. This does not suggest that during the period covered by Mr. Campbell's investigation non-dramatic satire was really difficult to procure. The Stationers' Register will furnish other examples.

It has often been found embarrassing to take the official utterances of British morality quite literally. One remembers that in 1597 the authorities issued an angry decree against the London theatres, commanding the owners "to pluck down quite the stages, galleries, and rooms that are made for people to stand in, and so to deface the same as they may not be employed again to such use." Hence it might be neatly argued that the vogue of poetic satire in 1597-99 was owing to the abolition of a dramatic outlet. But we know it was not so. The stages were not plucked down, and, as Sir

Edmund Chambers quietly remarks, Henslowe's *Diary* notes the resumption of playing two months later

TUCKER BROOKE

*Yale University*

---

*Die altenglischen Kennningar, ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde altgermanischer Dichtung* Von HERTHA MARQUARDT Halle (Saale) Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1938. Pp xvi + 238 RM 22.

The work under review was published in the *Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse* (14. Jahr, Heft 3). In it the author makes a substantial contribution to our understanding of kennings. The work was largely modeled on Meissner's well known book, *Die Kennningar der Skalden* (see p 2 bottom), and gives us a welcome supplement to that important collection. Miss Marquardt did not content herself with critical introduction and systematic list of kennings, however. She gives us, in many cases, exegetical discussions, the meaning of a given kenning being considered in terms of the various contexts in which it occurs. Her volume thus has value for textual criticism and interpretation, as well as for stylistic studies. In the following I will comment briefly on a few points which stand in need of clarification or correction. In her remarks on *wérloga* 'the devil,' the author might have brought out more clearly (p. 11) the fact that Satan was so called because he was thought of as the rebel against God, the treaty-breaker *par excellence*. The equivalents *áðloga* Christ 1604 and *tréowloga* Beowulf 2847 show (as she points out) that the literal meaning of *wérloga* was still felt, and it is doubtful to what extent, if indeed at all, the OE word, when applied to the devil, was understood *im übertragenen Sinne*, rather than in its literal sense. The author seems a bit too fond of deriving OE words from Icelandic (e. g. *þengel* p 17, *brand* p 53); I see no justification for such derivations, in the absence of evidence. When the author claims (p. 20) that the base-word of a kenning in OE never describes the form alone of an object, she forgets certain examples which she later adduces *holmes hring* (p 64) and *ýða ful* (p. 66), for instance, where *hring* and *ful* both have reference to the horizon (in the latter case the horizon is thought of as the rim of a cup). In *windes full* (p. 76) the reference seems to be, not to the horizon only but to the vault of the heavens (of which the horizon is the rim), the whole being compared to a cup turned upside down and seen from below. If *dægsceald* 'day-shield' means the sun (p. 84), we have another strictly formal comparison: the sun may be called a (round) shield by virtue of its form only. The author's argument (p. 95, note 1) against Kock's interpretation of *wópes hring* therefore cannot be maintained. The *dryhtibearn Dena*

of *Beowulf* 2035 should have been listed on p. 45 (sec 26), for a discussion of this expansion of the Danish name see *Anglia* LXIII, 107 f, the author, by a strange slip of the pen (p. 156), makes it a kenning for Ingeld! Vincenti's heretical interpretation of *bearn heofonwara* (p 48) hardly deserves serious consideration. The etymology of *sioleða* ascribed (p 64, note 1) to Hoops actually goes back to Bugge, as Klaeber (*Beowulf*, 3d ed., p 212) duly noted. The author wrongly attributes to OE *rád* the modern meaning 'road' (pp 69 f), such a kenning as *brimráð* 'sea' is better associated with *brimhenqest* 'ship' (the sea being thought of as a place where riding goes on). The author is surely wrong, too, in giving to *fyrqenstréam* the meaning 'mountain stream' (p 74). The first element means rather 'mountainous, huge, immense' and the word is a kenning for 'ocean' in *Beowulf* as elsewhere. Common sense tells us that an arm of the sea, not a mountain stream, is the natural object associated with the *fengelád* of *Beowulf* 1359, and this same arm of the sea is referred to in *Beowulf* 2128. Likewise *fyrqenbeam* 'huge tree' and *fyrqenholt* 'huge wood'. See my discussion in *English Studies* XIV, 190 ff. Among the kennings for 'hall' (p 201) should have been listed the *bū folcbeorna* of *Beowulf* 2220 (see *JEGPh* XXVII, 318 ff). The author is mistaken when she says (p 119) that a kenning *hléorberg* is recorded in *Beowulf* 304, this hypothetical word is the product of a needless emendation, see *Medvum Ævum* II, 58 f. Berendsohn's bold derivation of Hjaltri (p 122, note 2) seems to have been inspired by A. Olrik, *Danmarks Heltedigtning* I, 139. On p. 135, line 9, for III read II. The discussion on p. 142 calls for a reference to my treatment of the subject in *RES* III 269 f. The author incautiously remarks (p 150 footnote) that *worold-* 'earthly' would be *auf-fallend* in *Beowulf*. But if the poet is allowed to say *woroldcýning* in lines 1684 and 3180, why must he be forbidden to say *worold-rædend* in line 1142? Klaeber is wiser than Miss Marquardt in not attempting to defend his indefensible emendation. It is overbold to say (p 190) that Christ is called *engel dryhtnes* in *Rood* 9, this passage is manifestly corrupt, and in the circumstances one must hesitate to attribute to the pious poet so heretical a belief. In the editions of Cook and of Dickins-Ross, to which the author refers (p. 217), the passage is duly emended, and the author ought not to have passed these conjectures over in silence.

KEMP MALONE

---

*The Battle of Brunanburh*, edited by A. CAMPBELL. London. Heinemann, 1938. Pp. xvi + 168 10/6.

This is the most thorough edition of *Brunanburh* ever published. It lacks a bibliography, to be sure, but the "list of books used" and

the notes, taken together, give the student information enough for all practical purposes. Here the edition reminds one of the *Widsith* of Chambers, which also lacks a bibliography. The many appendices likewise remind one of Chambers. Nevertheless, Campbell differs from Chambers in that he is primarily concerned with his poem, not with its setting and background except as these throw light on the poem (the reverse holds of Chambers' *Widsith*, of course). The editor has done a careful and accurate piece of work. In an introduction of 80 pages he gives a full treatment of (A) the text, (B) the meter, (C) the poem and its place in OE literature and (D) the poem as history and the site of the battle. There follows a diplomatic text (MS A) with variant readings from the other MSS. Then comes the critical text (pp. 93-5) together with the notes (pp. 96-121), these are followed by the glossary and six appendices. Editor and publishers are both to be congratulated on this book.

A few details may be briefly commented on. The editor usually speaks of the OE Chron. (pp. 1, 43, 60), but once he calls it the AS Chron. (p. xi), why not be consistent? The best name for this work is that suggested by F. P. Magoun, namely, OE Annals. The punctuation now and then strikes one as odd, as on pp. 13, 17, 32, 34, 60, 65. The use of the term "letter" (p. 32, cf. p. 79) for the initial sound of a stressed syllable is unhappy. No statistics are given (p. 32) for those cases in which only one arsis of the onverse alliterates (but cf. p. 21 f.). If the editor is right in thinking that the poem exemplifies an "artificial preservation" or a "resurrection of the old style" (p. 38), then his doubts about palatal and velar *g* alliterating (p. 33) are not justified. I cannot agree with the editor that Simeon's *Guthfredr* is an error for *Guthfridr* (p. 49). See Noreen, *Altisl. Gram.*, 4th ed., pp. 70, 213. Simeon's form is particularly interesting in that it wants u-mutation. The by-name *rauðr* given to Anlaf in the *Egilssaga* is derivable from *Guðrøðr*, the second element of the name being used as a pet-form and identified with *røð*, the East Scandinavian equivalent of Icelandic *rauðr* 'red'. The editor is therefore wrong in saying that the saga "sheds no light on the question" (p. 50), the Ólafr of the saga was surely the son of Guthfrith, *alias* Guðrøðr or Røði. The D reading *eofofan* 7 was hardly from an earlier *eofofan* (p. 97). A phonetic explanation of *gealgodon* and the like (p. 97) might have been given. The note on *andlang* (p. 104) should have included a reference to the gloss *anlangcempa* 'miles ordinarius.' With the form *Anelaf* (p. 106), compare *Anlafus* (p. 155); we have here, it would seem, Anglicized and Latinized forms of the name (note the *Onela* of *Beowulf*). The emendation of *flotan* to *flotena* (p. 108) is hardly right. The original may have read *flotana and Sceotta*, if so, apocope to *flotan* would be easy, and this apocope would be disguised by the use of the usual abbreviation for

the conjunctive particle. The editor mentions this possibility, yet emends to *flotena* nevertheless, although the proper emendation in such case would surely be *flotana*. The A reading *fealene* (p. 109) is not well described as odd, we have here a phonetic spelling (the scribe himself pronounced unstressed *o* as *e*) On *Ira land* (p. 116), see *Speculum* v, 143

KEMP MALONE

## BRIEF MENTION

*Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française.* Par WINIFRED NEWTON Paris Droz, 1939. Pp. 167. A dissertation treating a familiar theme, this work presents only a small amount of new material. One can say, however, that Miss N has made a careful and extensive study of the subject and presented her results intelligently and concisely. The title is somewhat misleading as in certain periods she limits herself to the theme of Phaedra and Hippolytus, while in others she discusses other stories of virtuous stepsons and wayward stepmothers. In the latter case her choice seems arbitrary, including, for instance, Tristan's *Mort de Chrispe*, but excluding Camus's *Agathonphile* and the play that Françoise Pascal derived from it. The bulk of her work, pp. 21-124, is devoted to Garnier, La Pinelière, Gilbert, Bidar, Pradon and Racine. A single chapter, pp. 125-38, is not enough to discuss "de Racine à nos jours." While she usually shows good judgment in handling her theme, I must take issue with her on one point. She attacks (p. 103) M. Gros for speaking of jealousy as supplying in *Phèdre* the motive for calumny and goes on to say that, if *Phèdre* had confessed in IV, 4, she would not have saved Hippolytus. "C'est là, justement, le coup de génie de Racine, qui dédaigne comme une banalité dramatique . . . la jalousie, ressort de l'action!" Racine, who had recently created Eriphile, would not have thanked her for this praise. As a matter of fact, neither Theseus, nor his wife, nor Aricie considers the prayer to Neptune irrevocable.<sup>1</sup> Jealousy is not the basis of calumny in the tragedy, but jealousy, added to other emotions, prevents *Phèdre* from inducing her husband to revoke his prayer. Otherwise Racine would not have introduced her into IV, 4. He was too good a classical craftsman for that.<sup>2</sup>

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

<sup>1</sup> Cf vv 1191-2, 1196, 1315, and especially 1336-7 " Il en est temps encor "

<sup>2</sup> P 72, the actors of "Monseigneur le Prince" must be those of Condé,

*The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach.* By ROBERT HAMILTON BALL Princeton University Press, London Oxford University Press, 1939 Pp xiv + 468 \$5 00 If it seems a trifle ironic that, of them all, Massinger should be the one to inspire a monument like this, the answer is that (excepting Shakespeare, whose monuments are everywhere) he was the only English dramatist before Gay to write a play that would maintain itself in the repertory down to our own time Despite the secondary claim of its title page that this is "A History of the Stage," Professor Ball's lively and handsomely illustrated volume is essentially the chronicle of *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* on the British and American boards, though numerous and entertaining asides relate to—shall we say?—subordinate concerns of those theatres It is a fanatical book, on this subject its author is an Ancient Mariner, and you will gratefully discover, when you begin to read him, that you cannot choose but hear

H. S.

---

*The Relation of Molière to Restoration Comedy* By JOHN WILCOX New York Columbia University Press, 1938 Pp. xii + 242 \$3 00 This sober and workmanlike study corrects and replaces Miles's *The Influence of Molière on Restoration Comedy*. After a sketch of the debate on native versus French contributions and a formulation of method designed to discriminate between mere borrowing and genuine influence, Professor Wilcox runs rapidly over the English pieces, of minor as well as of major dramatists He concludes that Molière "made no significant contribution to the type of comedy we associate with the Restoration" It "grew in the rich soil of British social and dramatic conventions from seeds sown by Ben Jonson." Precisely how it grew still awaits detailed study, we need more dissertations on post-Jonsonian and Restoration comedy Meanwhile Mr Wilcox's negative report will be read with grateful interest by all students of seventeenth-century drama. His bibliography contains several items that I, for one, had either missed completely or had not thought of in connection with this problem

H. S.

---

not of the Prince of Orange, for in 1675 France and Holland were at war P 160, may I add that Parts I and II of my *History of French Dramatic Literature* were published in 1929 and 1932, not in "1920-28," and that only Part I was published by the Presses universitaires?

*Medieval Number Symbolism*, by V F HOPPER New York Columbia Univ Press, 1938. Pp. xiv, 241 \$2 90 This book is vol 132 of the Columbia University studies in English and Comparative Literature. It is well printed and bound and attractively got up The work makes interesting reading, but is a survey rather than a study, it seems to have been designed as a work of vulgarization, and as such it ought to prove useful The title of the book is somewhat deceptive, since only two of the seven chapters deal with medieval times The seventh chapter, devoted to Dante, approaches a study more closely than the other chapters do, and this chapter might well have been published as a learned article, though even here the treatment is too sketchy to be probative It might be better, perhaps, to say that the author, in his laudable endeavor to give us a picture of the wood, has done too much thinning of the trees, certainly his work leaves upon the reader the impression of thinness rather than solidity

K M

---

*A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, Sixth Supplement, 1935, pp 1433-1550, and Seventh Supplement, 1938, pp 1551-1652. By J E. WELLS New Haven Yale Univ Press \$1 50 each The *Manual* proper came out in 1916, its first supplement appeared in 1920, the other supplements have come out at three-year intervals. The various supplements have served us well, not least the last two, but their number now makes it needful to look up a given item in so many different places that one is perhaps justified in hoping for a new edition of the *Manual*, in which the supplementary material will be incorporated. By the year 1941 the *Manual* will have been in print for a quarter of a century, and the celebration might well take the form of a new edition Let us hope it does.

K M.

---

*Historia Destructionis Troiae*, by Guido de Columnis, edited by N E. GRIFFIN. Med. Acad. of America, Publication No. 26, Cambridge, Mass, 1936 Pp xviii, 293. \$4 This is an eclectic edition of the text of Guido, it makes no claims to finality, but will be useful to students interested not so much in Guido as in the history of the Troy tale. Besides the text we are given a seven-page introduction, a three-page glossary of uncommon words, and an index of proper names (unfortunately not all the occurrences of all the names are listed).

K. M.

## CORRESPONDENCE

ROBERT A. HALL, JR., "ITALIAN ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES" (*Language*, xv, 34-42) J'ai qualifié ici (*MLN*, 1939, p. 237) les étymologies de M. Hall de 'subjectives' ou 'impressionnistes' et je dois justifier ce jugement. M. H. a une façon cavalière de traiter les propositions étymologiques de grands devanciers comme impossibles, oiseuses ou peu convaincantes, mais ce qu'il oppose à des maîtres comme Schuchardt, Meyer Lubke etc. ne sont que des suggestions gratuites, banales, ne sortant pas des habitudes des néogrammairiens de 1876, sans l'ombre d'une preuve, quelquefois un remaniement tout verbal de suggestions données longtemps avant lui par d'autres savants. Dire par exemple que l'ital *aduggere* 'inardir, aduggiare' (M. H. omet la première signification, qui est sans doute aussi la primitive, en traduisant 'to irritate, anger') et *uggia* 'disgust' remontent à un radical \**ugg-* qu'on obtient par la fusion de *ūr-ere* et *odum* et que ces deux mots italiens "are not usually listed together, despite the kinship of meaning" est faux, puisque Salvioni dans quelques lignes d'une magistrale brièveté (*Rev. de dial. rom.*, iv, 100), que M. H. rejette avec un laconisme moins magistral ("despite Salvioni's opinion"), les a groupés ensemble et les fait remonter tous deux à (*ad*) *ūrere*. Une étymologie simple sera toujours préférable à une étymologie à base de croisement. Pour le développement phonétique sur lequel ni Meyer-Lubke ni Salvioni ne se prononcent (parce que, évidemment, avec leurs connaissances profondes, ils n'y voyaient aucune difficulté), ne faut-il pas songer à la dissimilation si courante de *r-r* en *d-r* (*quaerere* > *chiedere*, *ferire* > *fiedere*) ? \*(*ad*) *ūd(ι)o* donne (*ad*) *uggio* comme \**quaerio* > *cheggio* (d'ailleurs, dans les exemples fournis par Tomm-Bell on ne trouve pas l'infinitif de l'en-tête). La forme (*ad*)-*uggiare* peut avoir été influencée par (*ab*) *bruciare*.

La façon de travailler de M. H. est assez douteuse au sujet de sa supposition ital *attraccare* = *attaccare* + *trarre*, j'avais communiqué à l'éditeur de *Language*, qui me consultait, la référence à Joan Coromines, *Homenajes a Rubió y Lluch*, III, 283, où cet auteur catalan prouve que plusieurs mots de marine italiens proviennent de Catalogne. M. H., sans avoir vu l'article et sans mentionner d'où il tient cette "référence," s'y oppose parce qu'un -*kk-* italien ne pourrait provenir d'un *k-* catalan—il faut ne jamais avoir entendu le -*k-* intervocalique des langues ibériques pour risquer cette assertion; cf. ital *vigliacco* < esp *bellaco*. D'ailleurs le sens de *attraccare* 'accoster un quai pour embarquer ou débarquer des marchandises' (ce dernier détail, donné par le *Dizionario della marina* de l'Académie italienne et par Mistral, est passé sous silence par M. H.) se rattache, comme l'a bien vu Mistral, à prov *traco* 'pile de planches, de bois de charpente,' *atraca* 'empiler, entasser,' et en dernier lieu à l'onomatopée \**trak(k)* REW, n° 8846 (cf. esp *traquear* 'crépiter, secouer, agiter'). Encore une fois, la contamination n'est qu'un pis aller.



L'it *incignare* 'étrenner' serait un *encaemare* + (in)cingere J'avais transmis à l'auteur la référence au bel article de M Jaberg, *RLR*, I, 122 seq sur les mots signifiant 'commencer,' que le maître suisse place dans un vaste cadre d'histoire ecclésiastique Au lieu de s'effrayer de sa propre sécheresse devant cet article si important et pour l'histoire des mots et pour l'histoire de la civilisation, M H a changé son texte original et, maintenant, ne mentionne de l'article de M Jaberg qu'une objection selon lui possible, le piètre détail de l' *i* au lieu de *e* qu'il explique par un croisement avec *cingere* Mais \**incemare* > *incignare* est aussi correct en florentin du point de vue phonétique (*e* > *i*) que *cingere* (fr *ceindre*) et d'ailleurs aussi, *pace* M H, *cominciare*, v Meyer-Lubke, *Ital Gr* § 69

Anc vén etc (as)*sunar*, padouan *arsunar*, siennois *asciunare* serait un \**ad se unare* 'to gather to oneself' Tout romanisant ayant un peu de sens linguistique se dirait qu'un 'assembler à soi,' pléonastique et pétrifié aussi anciennement (des cas comme fr *jordonner* ou esp *ensimismarse* sont de beaucoup postérieurs), est impossible et isolé Mais M H ne semble pas avoir consulté le *Beitrag* de Mussafia qui dit "Es scheint ein Compositum mit *su s-*," ce qui est très plausible, vu l' *a* esp *de suno* [= *sub-ānu*] 'ensemble,' galic *asuar* 'rassembler' (REW s v *ānus*) Pour sienn *asciunare* cf sienn *sciugnolo* 'chétif,' REW s v *unus* et Arch rom VII, 396 Sur it *coccolarsi* M H dit dictatorialement "The semantic transition 'to cluck' > to sit in the position of a brooding hen > to squat' is quite unlikely." Pourquoi? est-ce qu'un grec *coccyx* 'queue rudimentaire', inattesté dans les langues romanes, dont dériverait un \**cocculum* gratuitement admis par l'auteur (comment *coccyx* avec son radical finissant en gutturale pourrait-il avoir un diminutif \**cocculum*?—autant admettre *cochlea*!) et qui serait en plus développé d'une façon savante à cause de l'esp *en cucullas*, à l'ombre d'une réalité?

Lucques *infolcarsi* 'cacciarsi, impacciarsi in una cosa,' 'ingolfarsi' serait dérivé de la racine \**fulc-* 'to push, drive, thrust' identique avec *fulc-ire* 'étayer, affermir, soutenir' Je ne sais d'où M H a tiré un verbe \**fulc-* (il ne nous donne pas la forme de l'infinitif) dans le sens 'to push, drive, thrust' Pense-t-il à ce lomb etc *folka* 'calpestare' que Salvioni, *Arch glott*, xvi, 449 expliquait par *follare* + *calcare* et Pieri, *ZRPh*, xxx, 301 par \**fulicare*? M H ne dit un traître mot sur le \**fulc-are* qu'il doit nécessairement admettre pour rendre compte du verbe italien Revenons-nous à l'opération avec des racines, heureusement abandonnée depuis longtemps par les romanistes? Pour moi il s'agit d'un dérivé du germ *fūlk* 'troupe, troupeau' (REW 3559) atteste au moins en a fr, a prov, a ital du Nord 'se mêler à une foule,' cf fr dial *foucade* 'flot, chute, survenance de gens nombreux qu'on n'attend pas,' 'espèce de panique qui se produit dans une bande de bœufs' (FEW). M H se lance hardiment dans l'étymologie latine en expliquant *dūbulcus* 'pâtre de bœufs' par son hypothétique \**fulc-* 'to drive' (Ascoli avait déjà pensé à *fulc-ire* 'soutenir'), alors que le rapport avec *φύλαξ* 'gardien' semble plus probable (cf Walde, Boisacq)

L'argumentation de M H au sujet de *lazzo* 'stage trick, gag' = *actio*

d'après Pieri est spécieuse "Such a learned origin for the term is un likely, in view of the intellectual status of sixteenth and seventeenth century actors"—un mot savant ne le reste pas toujours, comme Giliéron l'a montré et comme toute observation de n'importe quelle langue vivante peut le démontrer (cp fr *espérer, préparer, espèce* etc) Or, *azzo* de *actio* (qui d'ailleurs a une texture moins savante que p ex *dazio, prefazio* = *datiō, praefatiō*) a un parallèle dans a ital *stazzo* 'arrêt' = *statio* que Pieri a mentionné, mais que M H s'abstient de discuter qu'on lise les acceptions tout à fait populaires 'magasin,' 'hutte de feuillage,' 'parc,' 'étable' qu' a le mot dans les dialectes italiens et sardes (REW<sup>3</sup> s v *statio*), pour se persuader qu'un *azzo* peut avoir été un mot semi-savant p ex au XIII<sup>ème</sup> siècle et être devenu un mot populaire au XVI<sup>ème</sup>, date de l'apparition du sens 'théâtral' En outre, le parallélisme sémantique de (*l*)*azzo* avec *atto* (Lucques *attoso* 'che fa mosse d'occhi e di volto con un certo fine e con artificio,' Bellinzona *atas* 'gesti composti,' Salvioni, *RdR*, iv, 96, ital *atteggiare* etc) est frappant M H ne s'arrête pas aux phrases du *chianajuolo* (Arezzo) rapportées par Pieri pour *azzo nun me piace l' tu' azzo* 'non mi piaccion le tue mosse,' *lo conosco a l'azzo* 'ho penetrato il suo divisamento ai segni esteriori,' indiquant clairement l'idée de 'acte, geste' M H explique *atto* synonyme de *azzo* aux siècles XVI<sup>ème</sup> et XVII<sup>ème</sup> "as a Latinism in an attempt to connect the word with *actus* or *actiō*"—ici le 'latinisme,' auquel il avait fermé la porte principale du *The-saurus romanus*, revient par une porte bâtarde (pourquoi dans l'hypothèse d'un *lazzo* = *laqueus* les acteurs soi-disant peu cultivés de la Commedia dell' arte auraient-ils songé à latiniser (*l*)*azzo* en *atto*?) *azzo* serait une "aphérèse" de *lazzo* = *laqueus*, ce qu'on comprend moins qu'une "forme agglutinée" *lazzo* de *azzo* si *lazzo* était un mot populaire (= *laqueus* 'lacs'), comment arriverait-on à le décapiter? Au contraire un *azzo* semi savant avait beaucoup plus de chances d'être affublé de l' de l'article (cf fr *luette* de l' *uette* = *ūva*, mot scientifique etc) On devrait penser au moins que tous les parallèles anglais qui ont inspiré M H pour son *lazzo catch, gag*, sont bien analyses Eh bien, non! Le mot d'argot de théâtre anglo américain *gag* est à l'origine un 'bâillon,' puis depuis 1847, "matter interpolated in a written piece by the actor" (*Oxf Engl Dict*)—ce n'est donc pas du tout l'idée de "a joke conceived as something wherewith the audience is ensnared," mais de l' "interpolation," comme le bâillon est une matière "interpolée" dans la bouche de la victime

Quel sens cela a-t-il d'opposer à l'étymon de Meyer-Lubke (REW<sup>3</sup>, 5722, non pas 5709) \**mukka* (onomatopéique) > ital *mucca* 'vache' une contamination *vacca* + *mungere* 'traire'? La vache fait elle moins *mū* qu'elle n'est traite? Et l'all n'a-t-il pas *Muhkuh* (comme *Bahlamm* etc) à côté de *Milohkuh*? N'est-il pas plus vraisemblable que les enfants (qui ont été les premiers à appeler la vache *mukka* ou *Muhkuh*) ont été plus naturellement portés à envisager l'animal qui fait *mū* que le but rationnel auquel il peut servir? Quelle science peu humaine et peu aérée que celle de M Hall! Ne connaît-il pas au moins l'angl *moo cow*?

Dans la discussion de *dunque* M H opine "The various etymologies based on *dōnec*, *dōnque* or *dum* fail to account for the grammatical and semantic differences between these words (subordinating conjunctions meaning 'until') and the Romance group (adverbs meaning 'then, therefore, well then') " Mais il ne dit pas que M v Wartburg, dans le FEW qu'il cite, a attiré l'attention sur un lat vulg *dum* 'par conséquent' at teste par Loeffstedt, de sorte que *tum* + *dunc* peut bien suffire

M H accuse Meyer-Lubke de "petition de principe" "assuming an *eschu* to explain Ital *ischio* and then using this example on which to base a phonetic law of *i* < *e* before *-ski-*" Je suppose que tout établissement d'une loi phonétique passe d'abord par l'étape de pétition de principe ou d' "arbeitshypothese" et que M H ne fait autre chose en supposant, sur la foi de *tēschio* de *tēstula*, un *eschio* de *aesculu* > *eschulu* D'ailleurs Meyer-Lubke basait sa loi sur des exemples plus nombreux que M H la sienne il est vrai que ce dernier essaie de faire disparaître ces autres exemples par des assertions erronées p ex *viscum* 'gui' aurait *i* (d'où le sait-il? les langues romanes ne permettent pas cette base), *mischiare* serait influencé par *miatus* (> ital *misto*) je défie M H de me produire un incontestable *miatus* latin, alors qu'il n'y a qu'un *miatus* en roman (ital *misto* est naturellement un latinisme) Pour *biscia*, l'explication *bēstia* + *vīpera* de M Tuttle que M H trouve être la meilleure, se heurte aux sens 'insecte,' 'ver,' 'biche,' 'agneau, mouton,' que M Rohlfis a attestés pour la forme avec *-i* tonique dans différentes langues romanes

Le lecteur, impatienté par tant de rectifications triviales, se demandera peut-être pourquoi j'use son temps (et le mien) pour réfuter des explications viciées par la base c'est que je suis parfois un peu attristé par une pratique étymologique chez certains romanisants américains qui ne semble pas à la hauteur des standards de revues comme *Romania* ou *Zeitschrift* Me pardonnera-t on ce fanatisme ou prosélytisme peut être chimérique qui désire que tout dans ma patrie d'adoption soit, non seulement pas inférieur, mais supérieur au continent que j'ai quitté?

LEO SPITZER

WINCKELMANN Professor Walther Rehm, Giessen, Germany, Wartweg 68, would be grateful for notices of manuscripts and especially of letters by J J Winckelmann which are to be found in this country Professor Rehm is preparing with the support of the Prussian Academy of Science and the Archaeological Institute of Germany a critical edition of the works and letters of J J Winckelmann Communications may be directed to Professor Karl Vietor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Baker, Ernest A — The history of the English Novel, vol X—Yesterday *London* H F and G Witherby, 1939 Pp 420 16 sh

Brown, Carleton (ed) — Religious lyrics of the XVth century *Oxford* Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1939 Pp xxxii + 394 \$3 50

Chappell, Louis W — Folk-songs of Roanoke and the Albemarle *Morgantown, W Va* Ballad Press, 1939 Pp 203 \$3 00

Estill, Adelaide D — The sources of Synge *Philadelphia* U of Pa Press, 1939 Pp 51 [U of Pa diss]

Maxwell, Baldwin — Studies in Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger *Chapel Hill, North Carolina* U of N C Press, 1939 Pp x + 238 \$3 00

O'Neill, Edward H — Biography by Americans, 1658 1936, a subject bibliography *Philadelphia* U of Pa Press, 1939 Pp x + 465 \$4 00

Watkins, W B C — Perilous balance, the tragic genius of Swift, Johnson, and Sterne *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1939 Pp x + 172 \$2 00

Wilson, R M — Early Middle English literature *London* Methuen, 1939 Pp x + 309 8 sh 6 d

## GERMAN

Bader, Wilhelm — Goethes Farbenlehre als Ausdruck seiner Metaphysik *Diss Hamburg* 11 Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1939 66 pp M 3 30

Bithell, Jethro — Modern German Literature 1880-1938 *London* Methuen & Co [1939] vi, 535 pp

Blanke, Gustav — Hermann Stehrs Menschengestaltung *Diss Munster* [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte Bd 21] *Berlin* Junker & Dunnhaupt, 1939 104 pp M 4 50

Bielfeldt, Franz — Hebbels Menschengestaltung als dichterischer Ausdruck nordisch-deutschen Wesens Ein Beitrag zur literarhistorischen Anthropologie des 19 Jahrhunderts [Germanische Studien Hft 209] *Berlin* Ebering, 1939 115 pp

Braune, Wilhelm — Gotische Grammatik mit Lesestücken und Wortverzeichnis 11 Aufl, bearb von Karl Helm [Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germ Dialekte A, Nr 1] *Halle* Niemeyer, 1939 viii, 199 pp M 4 50

Guenther, Felix, J Leo Traub, Harold Lenz — Neue alte Lieder (German folksongs for class and club uses) *New York* G E Stechert & Co [1939] 32 pp \$0 15

Halbach, Kurt Herbert — Franzosentum und Deutschtum in hofischer Dichtung des Stauferzeitalters Hartmann von Aue und Crestien de Troyes—Iwein—Ivan [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Deutsche Philologie Bd 7] *Berlin* Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1939 196 pp M 8 50

Hartmann von Aue — Erec Hrsg von Albert Leitzmann [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek Nr 39] *Halle* Niemeyer, 1936 xxxvi, 262 pp M 6

Hormann, Paul — Untersuchungen zur Verslehre Otfrieds *Diss* [Aus Literaturwissenschaft Jahrbuch d Gorres-Ges Bd 9] *Freiburg* B Herder, 1939 vi, 105 pp 4°

Karstien, Carl — Historische deutsche Grammatik [Germanische Bibliothek, 1 Abt. Elementar- und Handbücher 1 Reihe, Grammatiken, 20, 1] *Heidelberg*. Winter, 1939 xlv, 200 pp M 9

Koch, Gustav — Adolph Mullner als Theaterkritiker, Journalist und literarischer Organisator *Diss Köln* [Die Schaubühne Bd 28] *Emsdetten* Lechte, 1939 110 pp M 4 50

Lock, Gerhard — Der hofisch-galante Roman des 17 Jhs bei Eberhard Werner Happel *Diss Beilm Würzburg* Triltsch, 1939. 103 pp M 3

Mittelhochdeutsche Minnereden 2 Die Heidelberger Hss 313 u 355, Die Berliner Hs Ms Germ Fol 922 Auf Grund der Vorarbeit von Wilhelm Brauns hrsg von Gerhard Thiele Mit 4 Tafeln [Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters Bd 41] *Berlin* Weidmann, 1938 xxviii, 248 pp 4° M 19 50

Pongs, Hermann — Das Bild in der Dichtung 2 Voruntersuchungen zum Symbol *Marburg* Elwert, 1939 632 pp M 20

Pribsch, Robert. — Letter from Heaven on the observance of the Lord's Day *Oxford* Basil Blackwell, 1936 xxii, 37 pp

Schneider, Hermann. — Richard Wagner und das germanische Altertum Vortrag [Philosophie und Geschichte 66] *Tübingen* Mohr, 1939 32 pp M 1 50

Schwarz, Ernst. — Untersuchungen zur deutschen Sprach- und Volkstumsgegeschichte Mittelmahrens Mit 6 Karten [Arbeiten zur sprachlichen Volksforschung in den Sudetenländern H 5] *Brunn, Leipzig* Rohrer, 1939 xii, 74 pp M 4 50

Ulrich von Turheim. — Rennewart Aus der Berliner und Heidelberger Hs hrsg. von Alfred Hubner Mit 2 Tafeln in Lichtdruck [Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters Bd 39] *Berlin* Weidmann, 1938 li, 614 pp 4° M 43

Warnecke, Rudolf — Haus und Hof in der niederdeutschen Sprache zwischen Wesel und Hunte [Deutsche Dialektgeographie H 35] *Marburg* Elwert, 1939 xiii, 78 pp, 4 Plates M 7 50

Zeller, Rose — Die Gudrunlieder der Edda Diss [Tübinger germanistische Arbeiten Bd 26 = Sonderreihe Bd 5] *Stuttgart* Kohlhammer, 1939 xii, 116 pp M 6

## FRENCH

Archambault, P — Ch Peguy *Paris* Bloud et Gay, 1939 160 pp Fr 15

Bac, Ferdinand — Mérimée inconnu *Paris* Hachette, 1939 249 pp Fr 20

Bandy, W T — A Word Index to Baude-laire's Poems *Madison, Wis* 1939 iv + 92 pp (lithotyped)

Bingham, A J — M-J Chemer, early political life (1789-94) *New York* 1939 xiv + 210 pp

Boileau — Epîtres Art p Lutrin Ed Ch-H Boudhois *Paris* Les Belles Lettres, 1939 375 pp Fr 30 (Ass Guillaume Budé)

Cowdrick, Ruth E — The Early Reading of Pierre Bayle, privately printed (1939) 216 pp (Columbia U diss)

Dauzat, A — La Toponymie fr *Paris*. Payot, 1939 338 pp Fr 60

Fohe Tristan, d'Oxford, ed E Hoepffner *Paris* Les Belles Lettres, 1938 189 pp Fr 20 (Pubs de l'U de Strasbourg, 8)

Gide, A — L'Evolution du théâtre, ed Carl Wildmann *Manchester* U of Manchester, 1939 39 pp

Grente, Pauphilet etc. — Dictionnaire des lettres fr Fasc I *Paris* Beauchesne, 1939. xxii + 42 pp Fr 24

Jean-Maurienne — Tribulations de la Soc des Amis d'O Mirbeau *Paris* Soc fr. d'impr, 1939 248 pp Fr 15

La Taille, Jean de — De l'Art de la tragédie, ed Frederick West *Manchester* U of Manchester, 1939 39 pp

Lautréamont, Comte de — Œuvres complètes Introd par A Breton *Paris*. G L M, 1938 xv + 421 pp Fr 30

Palleske, S O — Maeterlinck en Allemagne *Paris* Les Belles Lettres, 1938 189 pp Fr. 30

Puget, C-A — Les Jours heureux, ed F. Ernst *New York*. Cordon, 1939 ii + 154 pp

Rey, Achille — Un aspect nouveau de Fr Mistral *Avignon*. Ed des Tablettes d'Avignon, 1939 163 pp Fr 20

Rousseau, J.-J — Dialogues Rêveries Corresp Ed P Richard *Paris* Larousse, 1938 116 pp. Fr 2 50

Rozbroj, Hugo — Jean-Paul Mariat (1743-93) Ein Naturforscher u Revolutionär, sein Zusammentreffen in der Geisteswelt mit Goethe, Lamarck, Rousseau u a Berlin diss., 1937 138 pp

Ryan, Lee W — French Travelers in the Southeastern U S, 1775-1800 *Bloomington* Principia Press, 1939 viii + 107 pp \$2 00

Sarrasin — Le Roman du Hem, ed Albert Henry *Paris* Les Belles Lettres (1938) cxvii + 173 pp

Scarron — Le Roman comique, ed Magne *Paris* Garnier, 1938 xxiv + 440 pp Fr 15

Spalkowski, E — A propos des séjours normands de P Corneille *Rouen* Lainé, 1938 18 pp

Wilson, R. A. — The Pre-War biographies of Romain Rolland *London and New York* Oxford U Press, 1939 234 + iv pp \$3 75

## ITALIAN

Apolloni, E. — Guida alle Biblioteche italiane *Milano*. Mondadori, 1939 212 pp L 14

Bartoli, Daniello — Scritti vari Antologia da 12 opere con note commenti e introduzione di Michele Rigillo *Milano* Signorelli, 1939 179 pp L 7

Carducci, G., Del Lungo, I. — Epistolario fra Giosuè Carducci e Isidoro Del Lungo 1858-1906 *Firenze* Le Monnier, 1939 viii + 386 pp con 24 tavv L 18

Chiari, Alberto — Letture dantesche *Firenze*. Le Monnier, 1939 222 pp L 15

Ermoli, A — Note leopardiane *Roma*. "Ausonia," 1939 32 pp L 5

Ferrero, G. — L'anima e la poesia di Vittorio Alfieri 2a ediz rinnovata *Torino* Paravia, 1939 371 pp L 17

— Prosa illustre dell'Ottocento Giordani-Botta-Colletta *Torino* Paravia, 1939 130 pp L 7

Morrone, G. — Parabola del Romanticismo *Bari* Macri, 1939 116 pp L 10

Petrarca, Fr — Le Rime, i Trionfi e le opere latine Scelta e commento di Emanuele Chaffardini *Firenze* Le Monnier, 1939 viii + 207 pp L 11

Repertorio bibliografico della storia e della critica della letteratura italiana dal 1902 al 1932 (preparato sotto la direzione di Giuseppe Prezzolini) Vol II M-Z *Roma*: Ediz "Roma," 1939 Pp 573-1099

Santini, Emilio — Vittorio Alfieri *Palermo*. Palumbo, 1939 214 pp L 20

Stoppani, P — La parlata di Meneghino Dialectica 2a ediz *Milano*: A Vallardi, 1939 xii + 334 pp L 10

Zamboni, Armando — Fulvio Testi (1593-1646) *Torino* Paravia, 1939 111 pp L. 5.

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LV

FEBRUARY, 1940

Number 2

---

## A NOTE ON THE RELATION OF THE CORPUS CHRISTI PROCESSION TO THE CORPUS CHRISTI PLAY IN ENGLAND

The theory that the Corpus Christi play in England developed from the Corpus Christi procession has been described as follows <sup>1</sup>

It seems, then, that shortly after the confirmation of Corpus Christi in 1318,<sup>2</sup> pageants of the Biblical story were introduced in conjunction with the banners of the crafts. These at first were mute mysteries expressed in action. In a short time, however, spoken drama, found also in isolated cases in France, became an established custom in England. A spoken drama necessitated frequent halts by the procession, as it was impossible to act satisfactorily in motion. Indeed, connected pantomimic action would seem impossible in a moving procession, therefore this custom may be older than the spoken drama. These halts prolonged the procession beyond reasonable limit, and were avoided by transferring the pageants to the rear of the procession. A division of the procession immediately arose through the slower movement of the pageants, but the plays, though much belated, followed the traditional course of the procession through the city. Such seems to be a reasonable interpretation of the facts as presented by the records.

In a monograph undertaken to question this theory,<sup>3</sup> Miss Merle

<sup>1</sup> Charles Davidson, *Studies in the English Mystery Plays* (Yale Studies, 1892), p. 217. See also E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, II, 95-96, M. L. Spencer, *Corpus Christi Pageants in England* (New York, 1911), pp. 69-70.

<sup>2</sup> The Corpus Christi festival was confirmed by Clement V in 1311. See Chambers, *loc. cit.* For the statement that "the festival was a confirmed institution in England by the year 1318," see Hardin Craig, "The Corpus Christi Procession and the Corpus Christi Play," *JEGP*, XLIII (1914), 595.

<sup>3</sup> Merle Pierson, "The Relation of the Corpus Christi Procession to the Corpus Christi Play in England," *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters*, XVIII, part 1 (October, 1915).

Pierson postulates, on the basis of the description above, five stages in the development of the Corpus Christi play from the procession <sup>4</sup> I Crafts merely marching in the procession II Crafts with banners in the procession III Mute Mysteries IV Spoken drama in the procession. V Separation of the plays from the procession And Miss Pierson adds that, to be definitive, the illustrations of these stages must be worked out in some one place

As a result of her study, Miss Pierson is able to list records of Corpus Christi processions and plays in 31 towns, in no one of which does she find all five stages illustrated Furthermore, in one town only, York, does she discover a possible example of the important Stage IV, spoken drama in the procession <sup>5</sup>

From a study of churchwardens' accounts and other archival sources of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries,<sup>6</sup> I am able to add to Miss Pierson's findings data for twelve towns she does not include in her list,<sup>7</sup> and slight data for seven that she does include<sup>8</sup> These records of Corpus Christi processions and plays I give below, alphabetically arranged according to counties, towns, and churches within the towns.<sup>9</sup>

#### BERKSHIRE

##### READING

St Lawrence <sup>10</sup>

1507

"It paied for the makyng of a dublett of lethur & j  
peyr off hosyn off lethur agaynst Corpus Xpi day  
vij d"

---

<sup>4</sup> Pierson, *op cit*, p 110 The five stages here given are sufficient for my purpose But Miss Pierson suggests the addition of a sixth stage pageant wagons and actors in the procession after the separation from the plays See Pierson, *op cit*, p 111, also Spencer, *op cit*, p 81

<sup>5</sup> See Pierson, *op cit*, p 159

<sup>6</sup> Lawrence Blair, *Dramatic Activity of the Church* (unpublished Yale dissertation, 1933)

<sup>7</sup> Ashburton, Dunmow, Walden, Bristol, Dover, Sandwich, Oxford, Thame, Ludlow, Glastonbury, Pilton, and Yeovil

<sup>8</sup> Bungay, Canterbury, London, Salisbury, Bath, Reading, and Worcester A few of the items I cite for these towns are cited also by Miss Pierson, but for each of the seven towns I include material not used by her

<sup>9</sup> When the name of the church is not known, I repeat the name of the town, to indicate that the parish church is meant

<sup>10</sup> Charles Kerry, *A History of the Municipal Church of St Lawrence, Reading* (Reading, 1883), pp 92, 234

- 1508 "It payed to the same Willm<sup>11</sup> for rynging on Corpus  
Xpi day at *procession*"
- 1512 "It payed to Robt Slau for wasting of the *Taylours*  
*torchis* on Corpus X<sup>i</sup> day 11j d"

## DEVONSHIRE

## ASHBURTON

Ashburton<sup>12</sup>

- 1492 93 "In cost of bread & ale on Corpus Christi day to the  
players viij d"
- 1516 17 "For 111j 'ratilbagges' and 'vysers' bought for the  
players at the festival of Corpus Christi xx d"
- 1528 29 "For painting cloth for the players, & making their  
tunics, & for 'chequery' for making tunics for the  
aforesaid players, & for making staves for them, &  
crests upon their heads on the festival of Corpus  
Xti ix s ix d"
- 1537 38 "For a pair of silk garments (seroticarum) for King  
Herod on Corpus Christi day j d"
- 1547 48 "To the players on Corpus Christi day 1j s"
- 1555 56 "For keeping of the players' clothes 111j s 111j d  
Payd for a payr of glovys for hym that played God  
Almighty at Corpus Xpi day 1j d  
Payd for wyne for hym that played Saynt Resinent  
vj d"
- 1558 59 "For a payr of glovys to hym that played Christ on  
Corpus Xpi day 1j d"

## ESSEX

## DUNMOW

Dunmow<sup>13</sup>

- 1527 "for lyne, pakthrede, and whepcorde, whan Parnell  
made the pagantes on corpuserysti daye, 4 d"
- 1533 "Payde for a playe boke of Corpus Christi pagaunts,  
2 s 8 d"
- 1539 "to Ayer of Chelmysford for players garments and for  
feachyng of the same, 2 s"
- 1540 Receipts at Corpus Christi play
- 1541 "To the players at owre Corpus Christi, 6 s 8 d"
- 1542 *Received* "att Corpuserysty plays off Northend, 7 s,<sup>14</sup>  
for bred and ale sold, 7 s, total, 3 l 14 s 6½ d"

<sup>11</sup> William Poo, sub-sexton<sup>12</sup> J H Butcher, *The Parish of Ashburton in the 15th & 16th Centuries* (London, 1870), pp 10 38<sup>13</sup> *Essex Review*, xix (1910), 194-96<sup>14</sup> Followed by receipts from nine other towns



## WALDEN

Notre Dame de Walden <sup>15</sup>

- 1443 "homimibus pulsantibus in die Corporis Xpi ad process' 1j d"
- 1446 "Itm in pakthred & nayl in die Corpus Xpi p' le hers 1 d"
- 1449 "Johi Rownyng pro factur' meremij pani linei corporis Xpi 11j d"

## GLOUCESTERSHIRE

## BRISTOL

Christ Church <sup>16</sup>

- 1547 "Itm pd on Corpus Chryste day to master parson and prysts and clariks and chyldryn vj s viij d"

St Ewen's <sup>17</sup>

- 4 Hen IV Items similar to those for 1 and 20 Edward IV (See below)

- 1455 56 "Item, for beryng of the best cros on Corpus Christi day 1j d"

- 1456 57 "Item for beaing cross on Corpus Christi day, 2 d"

- 1 Ed IV "Item, for dyner on Corpus X<sup>ti</sup> daye in brede and ale x d

Item, the same day for befe, mutton, chykyngs and spyces xx d

Item, for the coke's labour and fuell 11j d

Item, for the beryng of the crosse the same day 1j d"

- 4 Ed IV "Item, for the costes of the dyner on Corpus Christi day xv d ob"

- 20 Ed IV "Item, for vj galons ale, a Corpus X<sup>ti</sup> day vj d

Item, for bering of baners the same day 1j d

Item, for mustard on the aforesaid Corpus X<sup>ti</sup> day ob

Item, for moton the same day 1j d ob

Item, for 1j pesis of beef x11j d

Item, for 11j rounds of beef vj d"

St John's <sup>18</sup>

- 1536 "Item payd to 11j priests upon Corpus Christi day x1j d

Item payd to the sexton upon that day 11j d

Item payd for 1j quarts of wine 11j d

Item to 1j chylder that bore the candlestick 1j d"

<sup>15</sup> Richard, Lord Braybrooke, *The History of Audley End* (London, 1836), pp 221-22

<sup>16</sup> J F Nicholls and John Taylor, *Bristol Past and Present* (Bristol, 1881-82), II, 176.

<sup>17</sup> Nicholls and Taylor, *op cit*, II, 251-52, *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Arch Soc*, xv (1890-91), 164-77

<sup>18</sup> Nicholls and Taylor, *op cit*, II, 150

- 1555 "Pd on Corpus X<sup>ti</sup> day to the peison iv *d*  
 Item to John Hill iij *d* for carrying the cross iij *d*  
 Item pd unto the iij chylder to beyer candlesticks iij *d*  
 Item for rynging of the bells against the procession v *d*"

St Mary-le-Port <sup>19</sup>

- c 1558 "Item paid for carriage of the cross and ringing of the  
 bells upon Corpus Christi day x *d*"

St Nicholas <sup>20</sup>

- 1534 "Item paid to viij priests to a procession on Corpus  
 Christi day at iv *d* a piece to them, amt 1j s viij *d*  
 Paid to the children that singeth viij *d*  
 Paid to children to bear iv candlesticks, 1j sensers and  
 the ship viij *d*  
 Item for bearing of the cross iij *d*"

KENT

CANTERBURY

St Dunstan's <sup>21</sup>

- 1500 *Inventory* "iij newe queers off the story of Seynt Dunstan  
 and 1j olde queers off thys same"  
 "A queer off the story of Seynt Thomas and the  
 dedycacion and Saint Mathy the Apostell and  
 Saynt Katteryn"  
 "A queer off Corpus X<sup>i</sup> and Saint Anne"  
 "A queer off the story of Corpus X<sup>i</sup> with the  
 legent febyll"  
 "1j quayers one off the story off Corpus X<sup>i</sup> and  
 halhoywyn"  
 1524 "For calves heddes for the ryngers for 1j yeres xiiij *d*"  
 1525 "For a calves hede flaggis and thredde at Corpus Christi  
 day for ryngaris viij *d*"  
 1527 The same as the item for 1525, with the omission of *for*  
*ryngaris*, and with the sum paid changed to 6 *d*  
 1545 "Item for flaggis bred and drynke on Corpus Christi  
 day 1j *d*"  
 1546 For "flaggis" on Corpus Christi day, 1 *d*  
 (This item repeated in 1547-48)

DOVER

St Mary's <sup>22</sup>

- 1537 "Item paid to them that bare the banners apou Corpus  
 Xpi day viij *d*"

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid*, p 225

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid*, p 163

<sup>21</sup> *Arch Cant*, xvi, 313-14, xvii, 83-111, J C Cox, *Churchwardens' Accounts* (London, 1913), p 213

<sup>22</sup> British Museum Egerton MSS 1912, ff 4b, 13b

- 1540 "Item paid to them that bare the banners upon the Assencyon & Corpus Xpi daye vij d"

## SANDWICH

St Mary<sup>23</sup>

Year unknown "Item to bearers of banners on Corpus Christi day"

## LONDON

## LONDON

St Andrew Hubbard<sup>24</sup>

- 1458-60 "Item, for naillys for the Canapy a gens Corpus Christi day"
- 1466 68 Flags and garlands on Corpus Christi day  
(Similar items until 1558)
- 1472-74 Flags, garlands, and "pakthrede" on Corpus Christi day, 5 d
- 1491-92 "Item, in costes to them that bore them torches and the canape ix d"
- 1492 93 "paid on Corpus Christi day for garlandys of Rossys & of wodroffe for the quyre & the torche berers xiiij d"
- 1493-94 "Item, paid ffor the brekffast for them that bore the Canape vij d"

St Margaret Pattens<sup>25</sup>

- 1524 "Pd for garlondis on corps Xti day for the quere vij d"

St Margaret's, Southwaik<sup>26</sup>

- 28 Hen VI "Also payd for flagges & garlandes for the torches upon Corpus Christi day vij d"  
(Similar items until 4 Edward IV)
- 35 Hen VI "Payed for Garlondes and pakthrede and drynkyng on Corpus Christi day vij d"
- 1485 *Inventory* "Item ij long crestes & ij short for the Canope gilt on Corpus Xri day  
Item ij stavys peynted grene to bere the Canope  
Item ij frengys of sylke, yellow & grene, for the endes of the Canope  
Item a dosyn poyntes of lede for the same  
4 banner clothes, one for Corpus Xri, one for St Margaret, one of the Passion, one of St Katharine"

<sup>23</sup> Wilham Boys, *Collections for an History of Sandwich in Kent* (Canterbury, 1792), p 364

<sup>24</sup> *British Magazine*, xxxi-xxxv, *passim*

<sup>25</sup> *Sacristy*, I (1871), 261

<sup>26</sup> *British Magazine*, xxxii, 487-94, 639-47, xxxv, 181

St Margaret's, Westminster <sup>27</sup>

- 1474-76 "On Corpus Cristy day for garlands for iij torches j d"  
 1484-86 "For garlonds of Reed Rosis on Corpus Xti day v d"  
 "For brede ale and wyne on Corpus Xtiday for syngers  
 of the Kyngs Chappell xij d ob"  
 1519 "Item, a monstre of silver and gilt to bear in the  
 Sacrament on Corpus Christi day"

St Martin-in-the-Fields <sup>28</sup>

- 1525 For garnishing four torches for Corpus Christi day, 12 d  
 (Similar entries until 1530)  
 1538 Torches for Corpus Christi day  
 (Similar entries until 1544)  
 1555 "Pd on Corpus Christi day for iij staves for the canopy,  
 for strawenge herbs & ffor poynts xj d"  
 "Pd on Corpus Christi day for flowers"

St Martin Outwich <sup>29</sup>

- 1524 "Item, ffor rose garlands on Corpus Xpiday, vj d"  
 (Similar entry for 1525)

St Mary at Hill <sup>30</sup>

- 1477-79 "Item, for Gailondis one Corpus Christi day, x d"  
 1479-81 "Item, for flagges and garlondis, and pak thredde for  
 the torchis, apon corpus christi day and apon saynt  
 Barnabeys day & other days And for vj men to bere  
 the same torchis, as it more playnly shewith by the  
 boke of parcellis, iij s vij d"  
 1487-88 "Item, for iij<sup>e</sup> laten belles for the canopye on corpus  
 christi daye, iij s iij d"  
 "Item, for garnyschyng of iij torches agenst corpus  
 christi xvj d"  
 1489-90 "Item, on Corpus Christi daye for Roose garlandes &  
 for beryng of iij torches, xij d"  
 "For ale and brede the same daye, ij d ob"  
 "Item, to ij<sup>o</sup> childern that went on procession on Seynt  
 barnabeys daye & on corpus christi daye, iij d"  
 "Item, for mending of a canopye to bear over the sacra-  
 ment on corpus christi daye vj d"  
 1490-91 "Item, for Roose garlondes, and off wodroffe ffor Corpus

<sup>27</sup> Cox, *op cit*, pp 209, 241, John Nichols, *Illustrations* (London, 1797), p 8

<sup>28</sup> John V Kitto, *The Accounts of the Churchwardens of St Martin in the Fields* (London, 1901), pp 13-165

<sup>29</sup> John Nichols, *Illustrations* (London, 1797), pp 272-73

<sup>30</sup> Henry Littlehales, *Medieval Records of a London City Church (St Mary at Hill) 1420-1559* (London, 1904-05), pp 81-83

- Christi daye, & to iij torchberers, & ffor Seynt  
barnabe daye, ix *d ob*"
- 1491-92 Roses on Corpus Christi day, 8 *d*
- 1492-93 " and for dressyng iij torchys on corpus crysty day"
- 1493-94 Garlands on Corpus Christi day 3 *d*
- 1494-95 Torches for Corpus Christi day
- 1498-99 For garnysing 8 torches on Corpus Christi day, 2 *s* 8 *d*
- 1502-03 " Payd to iij men for beryng of iij torchis on corpus  
christi daye, iij *d*"
- 1507-08 " Item, payde for beryng of viij torchys on Corpus Christi  
day abowt the parysche viij *d*"
- 1508-09 " Item, payd to viij men for beryng of viij torchis on  
corpus christi daye, viij *d*"
- 1518-19 " paid for the beryng of viij torches on corpus christi  
day which was this yere Midsomer Eve, the torches  
j *d* viij *d*"
- 1519-20 " Item, paid for ij dosen Garlondis on Corpus Christi  
day for the procession xv *d*  
Item, paid for ij dosen of Grene Garlondis for that  
procession ij *d*"
- 1520-21 " Item, paid for Garlondis on Corpus cristi day for the  
crossis and the quere v *d ob*  
Item, paid for beryng of viij torches that day, to viij  
men viij *d*"
- 1523-24 " paid for Garlondis for the crossis and the quere and  
for other Straungers that did bere copis on corpus  
cristi day xx *d*  
paid for beryng of viij torches that day with the  
Sacrament viij *d*"
- 1524-25 Paid for bearing of torches on Corpus Christi day, 8*d*  
Rose garlands for the procession, 16 *d*  
Paid to 3 men for bearing crosses, 3 *d*  
*Memorandum* "first, ytt is, that for the beryng of the  
crosses on corpus christi day that hit shal not be  
paid because hit shal not be no precedent, which is,  
ij *d*"
- 1526-27 " Item, paid for garlondis and Rosis & lavender on  
corpus christi day ij *s* v *d*"
- 1538-39 Garlands for Corpus Christi day, 2 *s*  
" Payd for iij men to bere torches on Corpus Christi  
daye iij *d*"
- St. Mary Magdalene, Milk Street <sup>21</sup>
- 1545 "pd for Rosse garlonds on corpus Cristi daye xij *d*  
pd for grene garlonds & bredd & dryncke the same daye  
iij *d*

<sup>21</sup> Chnrchwardens' accounts of St Mary Magdalene, Milk Street, London,  
1518-1665 Manuscript in Guildhall Library

- pd to pore men to carry baners & torches 11j d"  
 1559 "for Garlands upon corpusercristie daie & for banners  
 bering same xvj d"  
 St Mary Woolnoth <sup>32</sup>  
 1539 Rose garlands on Corpus Christi day  
 St Matthew, Friday Street <sup>33</sup>  
 1557-58 Garlands upon Corpus Christi day  
 St Michael, Cornhill <sup>34</sup>  
 1556 "For Garlandes on Corpes Cristye daie for them that  
 caried the canapye and otheres xvj d"  
 St Olave, Southwark <sup>35</sup>  
 1554 56 "pd for 111j staffe torchys for Corpus X<sup>ti</sup> daye 7s 12  
 June—pd more for xx11j garlonds for Corpus X<sup>pi</sup>  
 presessyone xx1j d"  
 1558 60 "Itm pd for garlands on corpus christi daie 11j s"  
 St Peter Cheap <sup>36</sup>  
 1447 Garlands on Corpus Christi day  
 (This item repeated in 1521)  
 1534 "It'm for garlondes on White Sondaye corpus x<sup>pi</sup> Daye,  
 holy thursdaye & saynte peters Daye, 1j s vj d"  
 1555 "It'm for garlondes of Roses on corpus x<sup>pi</sup> daye, v d"

## OXFORDSHIRE

### OXFORD

#### St Michael <sup>37</sup>

- 1434 35 "item for berynge of the banere polles on Corpus Crist  
 ys day 1j d"  
 (Similar item for many years)  
 1492-93 "Item for beryng of baners on Corpus Christi day 11j d"  
 1529-30 "item paide for beryng the baners on Corpus Crysti day,  
 1j d"  
 1530 31 "item payd for caryeng of the banners upon Corpus  
 Christi day, 1j d"

---

<sup>32</sup> J M S Brooke and A W C Hallen, *The Transcript of the Registers of the United Parishes of S Mary Woolnoth and S Mary Woolchurch Haw* (London, 1886), p xvi

<sup>33</sup> *Jour of the Brit Arch Association*, xxv, 370

<sup>34</sup> J C Cox, *Churchwardens' Accounts* (London, 1913), p 241

<sup>35</sup> Churchwardens' accounts of St Olave, Southwark, 1546-92 Manuscript in Bermondsey Public Library

<sup>36</sup> *Jour of the Brit Arch Association*, xxiv, 262

<sup>37</sup> H E Salter, *The Churchwardens' Accounts of St Michael's Church, Oxford* (*Oxfordshire Arch Soc*, no 78, 1933), pp 32-193

## THAME

Church of the Virgin Mary <sup>38</sup>

- 1523 "It' payed for the writing of the p'cells <sup>39</sup> of the iij  
kings of Colen & Herod on Corp<sup>s</sup> Xti day viij d "

## SHROPSHIRE

LUDLOW

Ludlow <sup>40</sup>

- 1545 For a "canape" on Corpus Christi day, 2d  
For nails and pins "to the canape," 2 d
- 1547 For making the "canapie" over the Sacrament upon  
Corpus Christi day, and for pins and tacks to the  
same, 10 d
- 1555-56 "Pins & points for the canape agaynst Corpus Christi  
tyde j d "  
(Similar entry for 1559)
- 1559 "Pd for a brekefast to them that did carry the canopie  
viij d "

## SOMERSETSHIRE

BATH

St Michael's <sup>41</sup>

- 1463-64 "Et pro bavalacione torticiorum in Festo Corporis Xti  
j d "
- 1473-74 "Et pro bajalacione vexillorum et torticium in Festo  
Corporis Christi et in diebus rogacionum iij d "
- 1476-77 "Et pro portacione crucis vexilli et torticium in diebus  
rogacionum et in Festo Corporis Christi iij d ob "

GLASTONBURY

St John's <sup>42</sup>

- 1428 *Inventory* "Item j canape cum ij foletts de plesauns <sup>43</sup>  
pro corpore Christi "
- 1500 "In expensis factis per magistrum hampton in die Cor-  
poris Christi pro lez pagetts cum j play in la belhay  
vj s viij d "

---

<sup>38</sup> F G Lee, *The History, Description, and Antiquities of the Prebendal Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Thame* (London, 1883), p 53

<sup>39</sup> Parts

<sup>40</sup> Thomas Wight, *Churchwardens' Accounts of the Town of Ludlow* (*Camden Society*, 1869), pp 22-92

<sup>41</sup> C B Pearson, ed, "Churchwardens' Accounts of St Michael's Bath," *Somerset Arch Proc*, xxv, 60, 72

<sup>42</sup> *Somerset and Dorset Notes & Queries*, iv, 144, 336

<sup>43</sup> A fine kind of gauze

## PILTON

St John Baptist <sup>44</sup>

- 1544 *Inventory* "Item a canype steyned to hold over the sacrament Corpus Christi day"

## YEOVIL

Yeovil <sup>45</sup>

- 1457 58 "In pulsantoribz pulsand in festo Corporis xpi dum processio ibat circa villam j d"  
 "Et solut Johi Mershe pro deposicoe de le canapy in festo corporis xpi"

## SUFFOLK

BUNGAY

St Mary <sup>46</sup>

- 1543 "It pd for sewyn s'ten abbs yt was occupyd at ye game on corp's xxi day j d"

## WILTSHIRE

SALISBURY

St Edmund's <sup>47</sup>

- 1461 62 "Et pueris hastas & vexilla portant' diebus rogacionum ascencionis domini Jouis in septimana Penthecostis & Corporis Christi xvij d"  
 "Et solut' Thome Rake Staynor pro factura xxxiiij duoden' signorum Jocalum p'c' duoden' j d in toto ij s Et in vij vlnis de ffemysshe pro vestiment' jocalibus inde fiendis p'c' vln' vj d in toto ij s. vj d Et Roberto Staynor pro le Staynyng' eorundem nichil Et Johanni Agas pro factura eorundem Et eidem pro [blank] vergis de blankett pro duplicata eorundem xvj d Et mimis Ciuitatis pro eorum labore xiiij d Et in vno pixide ad colligendam & conseruandam pecuniam xiiij d Et in diademis iij d Et Thome Bryman' pro corona & aliis vj d Et in ij lb canabis pro crimibus v d Et in j lb de ffustyeck vj d Et in Tynfoile vj d ob Et pro mamettis vj d Et in D<sup>e</sup> de pynnys xij d Et pro scriptura diuersorum nomini in textu ij d Et Thome Rake pro pictura

---

<sup>44</sup> E Hobhouse, ed, *Churchwardens' Accounts of Oroscombe (Somerset Record Soc, iv, 1890)*, p 52

<sup>45</sup> John G Nichols, *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica* (London, 1834-43), III, 140

<sup>46</sup> *East Anglian*, II, 149

<sup>47</sup> H J Fowle Swayne, *Churchwardens' Accounts of St Edmund's and St Thomas, Sarum (Wilts Record Soc, 1896)*, pp 688, 370



diuers' diademāt' vltra Tynfoile n'l Et Will'o Jonnes  
pro factura de Cheuerons vltra crines ad idem Et  
Joh'i Payne pro j cheueron n'l Et Will'o Smythe  
pro crinibus n'l"<sup>48</sup>

- 1462-63 Boys bore banners and spears on Corpus Christi day  
(Similar items, usually for banners alone, appear  
at intervals until 1544)
- 1469-70 "Et de den' allocatis Joh'i Payne Veuer pro apparell'  
lusorum per ipsum Johannem solut' in Septimana  
qua accidit festum corporis Xpi xj s x d"
- 1472 *Inventory* "Item j cowpe with ij angels of silver and  
on gilt seruyng on Corpus Xpi day for the sacrament  
and other tymes to be born on"
- 1473-74 "It' in j queyre bought with the story of Corporis Xpi  
ij s iij d"
- 1490-91 "Also in mony paid for ij dos' poyntes occupied abought  
paantes in the feste of Corporis Xi iij d"
- 6 or 7 Hen VIII Paid for torches for Corpus Christi day, 8 s 2 d
- 1523-24 Ale and money given to banner-bearers on Corpus Christi  
day
- 1540-41 "for costes done in the rogation weke wytsonday &  
Corpus Xpi daye on them that ronge bore banners  
and were appareled for the Processyon in breade &  
ale iij s x d"

St Thomas<sup>49</sup>

- 1547-48 Banners borne on Corpus Christi day

#### WORCESTER

##### WORCESTER

##### Worcester Priory<sup>50</sup>

- 1423-24 From accounts of the sacrist "In dono ludentibus  
Corporis Xti 3 s 4 d"

These records of Corpus Christi plays and processions,<sup>51</sup> taken from the accounts of 36 churches, serve to corroborate the conclusions reached by Miss Pierson. No church record here of a Corpus

<sup>48</sup> The editor of the accounts thinks these items refer to a Corpus Christi play. See Swayne, *op cit*, p xvii.

<sup>49</sup> Swayne, *op cit*, p 275.

<sup>50</sup> S. G. Hamilton, ed., *Compotus Rolls of the Priory of Worcester of the XIVth and XVth Centuries* (Worcestershire Hist Soc, 1910), p 68.

<sup>51</sup> I believe it logical to assume that the single entries included for garlands and banners (such as the entry from St Margaret Pattens, London) indicate a procession rather than mere decorations for the church.

Christi procession mentions a play in any form<sup>52</sup> No church record here of a play shows any definite connection of the play with a Corpus Christi procession

Since there must exist still many Corpus Christi records unexamined, Miss Pierson's investigation and mine do not necessarily invalidate the theory under consideration<sup>53</sup> But if proof of the theory be found, it will probably come, as Miss Pierson suggests,<sup>54</sup> from records dating from 1311 to 1400—for after 1400 there was spoken drama in almost all the towns studied by Miss Pierson—rather than from such late records as those found in churchwardens' accounts

LAWRENCE BLAIR

*Michigan State College*

---

#### THE ENGLISH *FAUST* BOOK AND THE DATE OF MARLOWE'S *FAUSTUS*

There are a number of important unsolved problems about P. F.'s English translation of the German *Faustbuch* of 1587, issued as *The Historie of Doctor Iohn Faustus* Chief among them are perhaps the manner in which the *Faustbuch* was brought to England, the identity of its translator P. F., and the date at which the English translation was first published The latter is cardinal in the current dispute as to the date of Marlowe's play of *Doctor Faustus*, known to be a dramatization of P. F.'s English *Faust Book* This paper will advance evidence tending to show that there was an edition of the English *Faust Book* at least as early as 1590, and that this edition was first printed at Cambridge. It will also make a suggestion about the identity of P. F.

No one has heretofore noticed, I believe, that there is a reference to "Faustus" in Henry Holland's dialogue, *A Treatise Against Witchcraft*, published at Cambridge in 1590.<sup>1</sup> In the course of a

<sup>52</sup> Miss Pierson finds three possible illustrations of Stage III (Mute Mysteries) See Pierson, *op cit*, p 159

<sup>53</sup> For another sceptical study of this theory, see Hardin Craig, *op cit*, pp 599 ff

<sup>54</sup> See Pierson, *op cit*, p 160

<sup>1</sup> "Cambridge Printed by John Legatt, Printer to the Universitie of Cambridge 1590" The date is made doubly sure by Holland's dedication

discussion about the power of witches to fly through the air, one of the speakers, Theophilus, remarks to the other, Mysodaemon,

* Faustus Drunken Dunstan art & in p 156	I will not denie, Mysodaemon, but the deuill may de lude his witches many waies in these transportations, & that many fabulous pamphlets * are published, which giue little light and lesse prooffe unto this point in controuersie This first under- stand, that whatsoever is saide of transportations, contrarie to the nature of our bodies, as to ride on the moone to meete Herodias, &c all such thinges are indeede but meere delusi- ons (Sig E3 <sup>r</sup> )
--	---

As nearly as possible, the passage is here reproduced exactly as it is in Holland, with the same distribution of words in each line and the same relative placement of the marginal references. The star also is Holland's

The Faustus reference may be to any one of four things (1) The original German edition of the *Faustbuch*. (2) A hitherto unsuspected and very early edition of Marlowe's play (3) A *Ballad of the life and death of Doctor Faustus, the great Cunngere*, entered in the Stationers' Register on February 28, 1588/9 We know nothing about this ballad save the bare title, for it is not extant, and no description of it has come down to us (4) P F's English translation of the *Faustbuch*, called *The Historie of Doctor Faustus*, the earliest extant edition of which is that printed at London by Thomas Orwin in 1592

The first two possibilities may be eliminated without much hesitation If Holland had meant to refer to the German edition he would probably have used some form of the German title, which is *Historia Von D Johann Fausten* ., "Faustus" is, rather, the name used in all English versions of the story Again, comparatively few even among the well-educated Englishmen of the Renaissance had a reading knowledge of German And, moreover, the companion marginal citation of *Drunken Dunstan* shows that Holland was speaking of English books I fear that the second possibility, that of a hitherto unknown edition of Marlowe's play, must likewise be rejected. It would offer a beautifully direct solution of the whole vexed question of the date of the play, but unfortunately it is contrary to all the evidence, affirmative and nega-

to the Earl of Essex, which he concludes with the words "The yeere of our saluation 1590"

tive, which has led to general acceptance of the view that the quarto of 1604 was its first appearance in print.<sup>2</sup> One may add that it is difficult to imagine how a popular play like *Faustus*, if once published before 1590, could be withheld from further publication until 1604.

There remains a choice between the ballad and the English *Faust Book*. For various reasons Holland seems to mean the latter. His use of the term "pamphlets" rather points in that direction, because whereas it was perfectly applicable in Elizabethan usage to moderately long prose stories like the *Historie* it was probably inapplicable to mere ballads, most of which were single sheet affairs. *NED* cites no instance of its being used to describe a ballad, nor does independent research uncover any such instance. But *NED* does give numerous examples of use of the term to refer to more extensive prose narratives. We do not know exactly how long the first edition of P. F.'s translation was, presumably about 80 pages, if later editions are indicative. Instances in which works of this length were called pamphlets are easy to find.<sup>3</sup>

*Drunken Dunstan* may provide a key to the problem, on the theory that what *Dunstan* is, *Faustus* is likely to be, since they are cited side by side. But *Drunken Dunstan* eludes identification. No such title appears in the Stationers' Register at any time before 1591 nor have I been able to discover it in any catalogue of early English printed books, or in any collections of the ballads of the time, or in others of the witchcraft manuals. No doubt it is some sort of attack on Dunstan, to whom, with other Catholic saints, Protestants gave a reputation for dissoluteness and magic.<sup>4</sup> But whether it is a ballad or a prose history I have not succeeded in ascertaining. The name has the raciness of a ballad. On the other hand, to what, then, does Holland's cryptic abbreviation "art.

<sup>2</sup> See pp. 1-2 of F. S. Boas' edition of Marlowe's *Faustus*, London, 1932.

<sup>3</sup> Anne Dowriche speaks of her narrative poem *The French Historie*, London, 1589, containing some 80 pages, as "this present Pamphlet" (sig. A2<sup>r</sup>). The same designation is made of Wm. Fulbecke's *Booke of Christian Ethicks*, London, 1587, 98 pp., and Wm. Kempe's *The Education of Children*, London, 1588, 60 pp.

<sup>4</sup> John Bale, *The Actes of Englysh votaryes*, London, 1548, p. 60; F. Coxe, *A short treatise declaringe the detestable wickednesse of magickall sciences*, London, 1561, sig. B4<sup>r</sup>; *Grim the Collier of Croydon* (Dodsley, vol. viii), Act I, sc. 1, p. 392.

& in p 156" refer? Certainly not to Holland's own book, which has only some 64 pages, and almost certainly not to *Faustus*, which even in its longest form as a prose history probably contained fewer than 100 pages, as has been remarked. Propinquity, moreover, attaches the "art & in p 156" to the Dunstan reference. If Elizabethans had been in the habit of binding together large numbers of ballads, one might suggest that *Drunken Dunstan* appeared on page 156 of such a collection, but that does not seem to have been the practise. All things considered, Holland's mention of "p 156" makes for the conclusion that *Drunken Dunstan* was a work of some length, and hence not a ballad. The abbreviation "art" most naturally suggests "article," but that does not seem particularly intelligible as a specific reference, nor does it assist us here.<sup>5</sup>

An additional minor point worth noting is that we know the English *Faust Book* to have contained (chs XX ff in later editions) description of the flights of a witch through the air, but we cannot be sure that the ballad did, since the ballad has long ago completely disappeared.

Finally, the nature of Holland's book and the position of the author himself are to be considered. *A Treatise Against Witchcraft* is a distinctly learned work. Holland was the holder of the B A and M A. degrees from Cambridge, a clergyman, and writer of several very godly works of Christian piety. He was less likely to be interested in common ballads than in a narrative of some dignity like the English *Faust Book*, and he was very unlikely to think ballads worth citing in an authoritative and considered analysis, which is what *A Treatise Against Witchcraft* purports to be.

We have now, I think, gone as far as the Holland passage will carry us. We do not arrive at certainty through it, but it does make probable, in my judgment, the existence of an edition of the English *Faust Book* at least as early as 1590. And this was not merely circulated in manuscript, for Holland explicitly says that the pamphlets "are published."

Where, then, was the edition published? Probably at Cambridge. The records of the Court of the Stationers' Company at London under the date of December 6, 1591, have this entry

<sup>5</sup> Another possibility might be "articulatum," piecemeal, meaning that the material was scattered in various places in the work cited.

Cambridge/ Alsoe at this Courte it was motioned/ that  
 for quietnes to be established betwene the  
 Uniu'sitie of Cambridge and theire Printers  
 and this Companie for matters of pryntinge, and for  
 the avoidinge of diuers disorders and troubles alredie  
 arisen and hereafter like to arise betwene the  
 said Partyes aboute printinge /  
 Yt mighte be Lawfull for the saide Uniu'sitye and  
 printers of Cambridge for the space of one monnethe after  
 the Retorne of everie ffrankford mart, to haue the choise  
 of anie forayne Bookes cōminge from the said marte, The  
 same to be allowed to the saide Printers of Cambridge  
 and by them to be printed/

From this it appears that Cambridge printers had, for some time before 1591, been eagerly buying books brought over to England from the mart at Frankfort in Germany. Now the interesting fact is that the first German edition of the *Faustbuch* was published by Johann Spies at Frankfort, whence it might pass by normal channels to one of the Cambridge publishers. Furthermore, Henry Holland, whose reference to "Faustus" has just been studied, was at this time in touch, probably quite close touch, with the Cambridge publishing trade after taking his M A at the university in 1583 he was until 1592 vicar at Orwell, scarcely a dozen miles from Cambridge, and in 1590 he secured John Legatt, printer to the university, as publisher of *A Treatise Against Witchcraft*. Holland could be expected to be well acquainted with Cambridge publications between 1587 and 1590, on the other hand, there is no indication that he went up to London at this time or had special access to books brought out there.

Again, Hale Moore has pointed out<sup>7</sup> that among Gabriel Harvey's marginalia is the following note, written on folio Giv<sup>r</sup> of his copy of Richard Morysine's 1539 translation of Frontinus' *Strategematicon*

if Doctor  
 Faustus cowlde reare Castles, & arme  
 Duels at pleasure what woonderful,  
 & monstrous exploits, might be  
 acheuid by such terrible meanes

---

<sup>7</sup> *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, ed W W Greg and E Boswell (London, 1930), p 39

<sup>8</sup> "Gabriel Harvey's References to Marlowe," *SP*, xxiii (1926), 337-57

After examining the dateable allusions in the other marginal notations in this book, Moore concludes that all fall between 1589 and 1590 or 1591. Hence he argues that the Faustus allusion is to be given "a later limit of 1590" His belief is that the allusion is to Marlowe's play, but I am strongly inclined to agree rather with Boas, who argues that it more probably is to the English *Faust Book* As Boas shows,<sup>8</sup> the passage quoted describes two episodes which may well have been added to the play only after Marlowe's death. Both, on the other hand, are clearly in the English *Faust Book* (chs XL and LII). It would seem that we have here another reference of approximately the year 1590, supporting Holland's mention of the same work at about the same date. And again Cambridge comes into the situation because Harvey lived and read there during the period which interests us G. C Moore Smith,<sup>9</sup> for instance, speaks of a reply which he wrote to Lyly's *Pap with a Hatchet*, dating it from Trinity Hall, November 5, 1589, but not then publishing it

In addition, no one will forget that Marlowe himself had taken his M. A. from Cambridge so recently as 1587 and presumably maintained ties of some sort with it afterwards. Either on an occasional trip back to Cambridge or through friends remaining there he might be expected to see whatever was most striking on the bookstalls of the town

All these bits of fact and speculation fit together with curious precision The story which they tell is that the *Faustbuch* was imported from Frankfort by a Cambridge publisher, entrusted by him to P. F. for translation into English, and then printed at Cambridge in time to be read by Holland, Harvey, and Marlowe at least as early as 1590, and probably a year or two before

If this reconstruction of the events is right and Cambridge is central in the early history of the English *Faust Book*, it is probable that P. F. also was a Cambridge man. The publisher would be likely to choose a translator near at hand, and would naturally turn to the university to find an educated man who knew German well. It is a good guess that if we could discover someone with the proper initials, who either was at Cambridge at this time or had recently been there, and who had travelled in Germany, we should at last have run P F to earth I am unable to make the necessary

<sup>8</sup> *Op cit*, pp 9-10

<sup>9</sup> *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia* (1913), p 58

investigations at this time, but very tentatively I might point out that there was a Peter Frenche who took the B. A. from Magdalene in 1581-2 and the M. A. in 1585, who seems to be a likely candidate. It may be something more than a coincidence that Henry Holland also took the B. A. from the same college, Magdalene, in 1580, only two years before him. One may remark also that P. F.'s being a Cambridge man, quite possibly acquainted with Marlowe, Holland, and Harvey, would help to explain why the attention of these three was attracted by the English *Faust Book*.

If my general hypothesis is correct, it would follow that we need not believe there was an edition of the English *Faust Book* put out by Abel Jeffes in London in May, 1592, no copy of which survives, as is supposed by Greg and others.<sup>10</sup> The basis for Greg's argument is a decision of the Court of the Stationers' Company entered in the records on December 18, 1592:

Abell Ieffes Yt is ordered that if the book of D̄cor ffaustus shall not Tho Orwin be found in the [beh] hall book entred to Richard Oliff before Abell Ieffes claymed the same wch was about May last That then the seid copie shall Remayne to the said Abell as his prop copie from the tyme of his first clayme wch was about May last as aforesaid / <sup>11</sup>

Greg concluded that Jeffes' claim must have been founded on his publication of an edition of the English *Faust Book* at London in May, 1592. This is still a possibility, but it would seem to be more likely that Jeffes was simply claiming as an assignee of the original Cambridge publisher as of May, 1592.

Finally, if I am right in thinking that there was an edition of the English *Faust Book* at Cambridge at least as early as 1590, the chances are that the traditional date of 1588 or 1589 for the composition of Marlowe's play is correct. Of course, there is always the possibility that even if his source was published in 1588, let us say, he might not make use of it until several years later. But the evidence shows that the *Faust Book* was arousing interest among Cambridge men fairly soon after its publication, and the natural assumption is that Marlowe would see it early and use it while its effect on him was fresh.

PAUL H. KOCHER

*University of Washington*

<sup>10</sup> Greg's argument is set forth by Boas, *op cit*, pp. 7-8.

<sup>11</sup> *Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company*, p. 44.



*LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST*, IV, III, 285-362

It is generally agreed that Berowne's long speech in IV, III, of *Love's Labour's Lost* includes lines that in the printer's copy were marked for deletion. For their inclusion in the text the most plausible explanation is that offered by Dover Wilson in the New Cambridge edition of the play.<sup>1</sup> According to Professor Wilson's theory, we have in the Quarto and all subsequent editions of the play not merely the first and second drafts of scattered lines, but the whole of Berowne's speech both in its original and in its revised form. He asks us to observe that the speech as we have it develops clearly enough up to line 314,<sup>2</sup> but that in the following line it begins all over again the argument which started at line 292. From this he deduces that the original draft of the speech went from line 285 to line 314, and that, when the play underwent revision, lines 315-362 were substituted for lines 292-314. The printer, however, mistaking the deletion sign of the manuscript, printed both speeches, with the result that in the Quarto they appear consecutively, in the order written.

Such, without the bibliographical considerations adduced, is Professor Wilson's hypothesis, an hypothesis which has been duly recorded in many of the subsequent editions of the play.<sup>3</sup> Yet to be completely acceptable, it needs, I believe, a slight modification. According to Professor Wilson, the first version of the speech must have ended with line 314. Yet neither is this line an apt conclusion to the speech, nor is the King's "Saint Cupid then! and soldiers to the field!" an apt rejoinder. A more careful examination of the speech is, I think, revealing. Line 314 concludes a passage which displays that toying with a word which is so characteristic of much of *Love's Labour's Lost*. The next three lines are virtually a repetition of preceding ones, but in the following lines there is a considerable change in tone. The expression is less bantering, the image more complex, the conception more poetic;

<sup>1</sup> Edited by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and John Dover Wilson, Cambridge, 1923, pp. 105-108.

<sup>2</sup> The line numbers are those of the New Cambridge edition.

<sup>3</sup> The Yale Shakespeare, 1925, pp. 118-119, The New Temple Shakespeare 1934, pp. VII-VIII, The Warwick Shakespeare, 1936, pp. 130-131, The New Eversley Shakespeare, 1936, pp. XXXI-XXXII.

and this tone continues, for the most part constant, down to lines 347-351, which are again an elaboration of preceding ones. With line 352, however, we revert to the tone of word-play, which prevails through the proposed oaths almost to the end of the speech, where the definite mention of "love" makes appropriate the King's exclamation. I should suggest, then, that the original speech included lines 285-314 and 352-362 and that lines 315-351 were later inserted to cancel lines 292-314. Not only does this make of the first version a complete and unified speech which gives a cue for the King's subsequent remark, but it affords a reasonable explanation of what seems to me a very decided change in tone beginning with line 352.

Such a modification, of course, does not fundamentally affect Professor Wilson's hypothesis. It necessitates only the supposition that Shakespeare wrote thirty-seven lines instead of forty-eight on his inserted sheet of paper, and such a supposition, despite Professor Wilson's emphasis upon the suitability of forty-eight lines, is wholly plausible.<sup>4</sup>

STARING B. WELLS

*University of Rochester*

## JACQUES' "SEVEN AGES" AND CENSORINUS

In *Modern Language Notes*, LIV (April, 1939), 273-6, Professor Draper deals with Jacques' "*Seven Ages*" and *Banholomaues Anglicanus*. He indicates *Batman uppon Bartolome* as the probable source of Shakespeare's divisions of man's life, and rejects the notion that the idea of the seven ages was a commonplace of the period.

While accepting the probability that Shakespeare had read *Batman*, one may add to his possible sources a work that enjoyed some circulation in Shakespeare's time, namely the *De die natali liber*

<sup>4</sup> It should be pointed out that Professor Kittredge in his edition of Shakespeare [1936] reduces Berowne's speech to order by indicating the omission of lines 294-316 (lines 298-319 in his edition). But from a bibliographical point of view the omission of these lines is less defensible than the omission of lines 292-314. Professor Kittredge's practice of italicization, however, is commendable and might well be followed by other editors.

of Censorinus. I quote the pertinent passage from chapter 14 in the rendering of Thomas Heywood

Mans Age was also divided into five Sections, and everie one contained fifteene yeares the first were called *Pueri, ex Puritate*, Children, by reason of their puritie and innocence of life the second to thirty, *Adolescentes*, from their growth and encrease the third section gave them the title of *Iuvenes, ab adiumenta*, because they were able then to assist in the wars, untill the forty fifth yeare At three-score yeares they were stiled *Seniores*, & Elder men And in the fift and last Section, all their life time after, they were called *Senes* Hippocrates (as Censorinus, *Lib de Die Natal* affirmeth) maketh seven degrees of the Age of man the first endeth in the seventh yere, the second in the fourteenth, the third in the one and twentieth, the fourth in the five and thirtieth, the fift in the two and fortieth, the sixth in sixty, and the seventh to the end of his life, &c (*The Hierarchie of the Blessed Angells*, London, 1635, p 165) <sup>1</sup>

Heywood continues to give Ovid's division into four ages (*Metamorphoses*, 15 199-213, 221-7). Censorinus says that the division into seven was by Solon raised to ten, and continues

Ex eis omnibus proxime videntur adaccessisse naturam qui hebdomadibus humanam vitam emensi sunt fere enim post septimum quemque annum articulos quosdam et in his aliquid novi natura ostendit, ut et in elegia Solonis cognoscere datur ait enim in prima hebdomade dentes homini cadere, in secunda pubem apparere, in tertia barbam nasci, in quarta vires,<sup>2</sup> in quinta maturitatem ad stirpem relinquendam, in sexta cupiditatibus temperari, in septima prudentiam linguamque consummari,<sup>3</sup> in octava eadem manere (in qua alii dixerunt oculos albescere),<sup>4</sup> in nona omnia fieri languidiora, in decima hominem morti fieri maturum (14 7) <sup>5</sup>

Possibly Censorinus furnished the outline for Bartholomaeus, at any rate there is a manuscript from the seventh century and one from the tenth <sup>6</sup> The Latin text was accessible in 1600, since there is a series of editions from 1497 to 1593 Perhaps Shakespeare, like Heywood later, turned to it. If so, he knew the opinion of Hippocrates at second hand An idea presented by both Batman and Censorinus probably is to be found in other books current at

<sup>1</sup> For a rendering by Sir Thomas Browne see *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, 4 12 Browne speaks of Censorinus as "an Author of great authority, and sufficient antiquity"

<sup>2</sup> Cf the soldier in *As You Like It*, II, vii, 149

<sup>3</sup> Cf "Full of wise saws and modern instances"

<sup>4</sup> Cf. "With spectacles on nose"

<sup>5</sup> Browne also renders this passage, *loc cit*

<sup>6</sup> *Censorini de die natali liber* (Leipzig, 1867), p xiv

the end of the sixteenth century If there is no treatment of the seven ages more fully developed, the vividness of the passage in *As You Like It* is almost wholly Shakespeare's

Duke University

ALLAN H. GILBERT

### IS *la Coupe enchantée* BY LA FONTAINE OR CHAMPMESLÉ?

M Gohin<sup>1</sup> has given a good many reasons for believing that five comedies attributed to La Fontaine and published in the standard edition of his works were in reality composed by Champmeslé So far as we can tell, no one in the seventeenth century supposed that they were the work of La Fontaine, whereas La Grange assigned *Ragotin* and *le Florentin* to Champmeslé, while the registers of the Comédie Française attributed to him *le Veau perdu* and recorded on April 8, 1693, the reading to the actors of a "petite comédie de M de Champmeslé," which was to be played "incessamment," so that the notice must refer to *Je vous prens sans verd*, acted on May 1 of that year In the case of *la Coupe enchantée*, however, M Gohin had only the fact that on Jan 26, 1693, it was Champmeslé who distributed the rôles of the play, a function that was normally the author's One might say that, as La Fontaine had by this time been converted, he would, if he had written the play, have left such mundane matters to someone else. Convincing contemporary evidence is consequently still to be desired

Now such evidence is furnished by the registers of the Comédie Française, though not in the place where one would first look for it. They mention the *Coupe* when it was first acted, July 18, 1688, but do not name the author then Fortunately, however, the prince de Conty, like other aristocrats of the time, was slow in paying his debts. He owed 437 francs, 5 sous, for "loges et places du Theas-tre" occupied while the *Coupe* was first being played and up to Dec 24, 1688. The ticket-taker of the parterre, appropriately called Subtl, sent to collect, induced the prince to pay on April 19, 1689 Each of the full-share actors received 18 francs from this payment, Subtl was rewarded for his activities with 5 francs, 5 sous, and "on en a payé a M<sup>r</sup> de Champmeslé pour vne part d'Autheur de la

<sup>1</sup> *Les Comédies attribuées à La Fontaine*, Paris, Garnier, n d [1935]

Coupe enchantée 10 [francs] ” One share because the *Coupe* is a one-act play. No mention is made of La Fontaine I must consequently conclude, with apologies to those who recognize in this charming production the style of the great fabulist, that contemporary evidence assigns the comedy, not to him, but to Champmeslé

H CARRINGTON LANCASTER

*PATHELIN*, 1519-1522

Towards the end of the farce of *Maistre Pierre Pathelin*, after the utter defeat of the draper's cause against Aignelet, he accuses Pathelin to his face of being the thief who stole his cloth Pathelin, in mockery, suggests that Guillaume has mistaken his identity and, after suggesting as a fictitious possibility *Esservellé*, a person named 'Brainless,' Pathelin asks whether the thief might not have been some one else

Seroit-ce point Jehan de Noyon?  
Il me ressemble de corsage

Le Drappier Hé deable! il n'a pas le visaige  
ainsi potatif, ne si fade!

Obviously, for this passage to have any humor at all, Jean de Noyon must have been a well-known personage to all the audience, and it may be assumed that he was small, skinny, and bald like Pathelin, or the opposite extreme and that he had a 'tippling, unsavory' countenance, though not so much so as the clown Pathelin The fact that he is suggested as a thief doubtless aroused an outburst of laughter, particularly if this Jehan were a man of sufficiently high position Louis Cons remarked many years ago upon the way in which this name stood out from all the other proper names in the play by reason of its expressive realism.<sup>1</sup>

The opinion expressed by the late Richard T. Holbrook in the *Index des noms* of his edition of *Pathelin*, which has been retained by Mario Roques in the second edition (1937), is doubtless the prevailing one on the identity of Jehan de Noyon.

<sup>1</sup> *RSS*, I (1913), 474 On pp 473-6 of this article Professor Cons sought to show that Jehan de Noyon was the author of *Pathelin*, but he abandoned this opinion shortly afterwards.

Il s'agit évidemment d'un personnage reel, connu de quelques-uns des premiers lecteurs de notre farce ou de quelques unes des personnes qui en ont vu les premières représentations, mais il ne s'ensuit pas que ce Jehan ait été originaire de Noyon, ni que cette allusion nous oblige à voir la moindre relation entre la farce et la ville de Noyon, il semble plus probable que ce personnage était tout simplement notoire dans une certaine région et que l'auteur de *Pathelein* a vu en lui un sujet de plaisanterie qui était trop locale pour rester longtemps intelligible

I do not believe that the *premiers lecteurs* have anything to do with the case, since such a farce was destined for presentation and not for reading, but chiefly I do not understand why the editors have neglected to mention the obvious Jehan de Noyon who must have been known to all the audience who lived in Paris or to the region northeast of that city—I refer to Jehan de Mailly, Bishop and Count of Noyon, who was consecrated on September 2, 1426, and who died on February 14, 1473<sup>2</sup> Jehan was related to the English royal family, he was the candidate selected by the Duke of Bedford as opposed to the one presented by the Duke of Burgundy. The Pope decided in his favor On September 17, 1428, Jehan did homage at Paris as “pair de France et comte de Noyon”<sup>3</sup> He was one of the judges of Saint Joan of Arc and he took part in the crowning of Henry VI as King of France But—once the Dauphin Charles had reconquered his kingdom, Jehan de Noyon changed camp speedily He hastened to participate in the rehabilitation of Saint Joan and he made amends for his previous English leanings In brief, he was a notorious turncoat During his whole term of office he had a case in court, against the Canons of his Cathedral as to who owned the relics of Saint Eloi His cause was not a good one since, after his death, it was eventually decided against him

It has not been possible for me to find evidence that Jehan, Bishop and Count of Noyon, had a *visarge potatif et fade*, but it should be quite evident that he was not popular and that an accusation of petty thieving directed toward him (who wished to pilfer relics from his chapter) would have provoked some mirth If

<sup>2</sup> Entry in the list of the Bishops of Noyon in le Comte de Mas Latrie, *Trésor de Chronologie* (Paris, 1889), col 1458

<sup>3</sup> These details on the life of Jehan de Noyon are given by M L Vitet in his *Monographie de l'Eglise Notre-Dame de Noyon* (Paris, 1845), a volume in the *Collection de Documents inédits*, p 246

authorities are correct in assuming the date 1464 for the composition of the *Pathelin* it is probable that Bishop Jehan was then seventy at least and we can count upon his being at that time not too shapely a figure and perhaps excessively ruddy in countenance. On the other hand, the humor of the comparison with Pathelin would have been just as effective to the audience if Jean de Noyon had had a resemblance that went to the very opposite extreme.

If this identification is plausible, then we have the date 1473 as a *terminus ad quem* and 1426 as a *terminus a quo*. All things considered the traditional dating, 1464, suits our case very well.

URBAN T. HOLMES, JR.

*The University of North Carolina*

---

#### THEOBALD'S ALLEGED SHAKESPEARE MANUSCRIPT

Much controversy has taken place over the reliability of Theobald's statement that his *Double Falsehood* was based upon a manuscript play of Shakespeare's. The view that the play was entirely Theobald's own, or that it was based upon a version of the Cardenio story this side of Shakespeare, has been disposed of, and the most recent students of the subject have shown the belief that he actually had a manuscript of Shakespeare's day. Additional evidence to this effect appears in the postscript to the following letter, printed by the Historical Manuscripts Commission (Vol. 29, part 6, p. 20) from the manuscripts of the Duke of Portland.

1727, December 10,

Lew Theobald to the Countess of Oxford  
Wyan's Court in Great Russell St.

As I have the good fortune to introduce an original play of Shakespeare to the town, it would have been greatly my happiness to have had the honour of approaching the Countess of Oxford. Your Ladyship is so great a patroness, and you have so commanding an interest, that all other solicitations would have been superfluous. Yet unknown as I am, Madam, I cannot but esteem it my duty to beg the influence of your Ladyship's recommendation. I have presumed to inclose twelve box tickets for my benefit, which will be received on the 3rd, 6th, or 9th night of the play being acted. The best title I have to flatter myself that your Ladyship will disperse them for me is from your known goodness, from which too I

can only hope pardon for the liberty of this address and the presumption of subscribing myself, &c

Postscript If your Honour has any mind to read the play in manuscript, upon the earliest intimation of your pleasure you shall command it

JOHN CADWALADER

*Unversity of Pennsylvania*

### THE TEXT OF GROBIANA'S NUPTIALLS

In 1904, Ernst Ruhl printed the text of the early seventeenth century academic play *Grobiana's Nuptialls* (see Boas, *Camb. Hist. Eng Lit*, vi, 483) from the unique Bodley MS 30, 13<sup>r</sup>-25<sup>r</sup> inc. (see Madden, *Summary Catalogue* v, 316), as part of a literary survey entitled *Grobrianus in England (Palaestra, xxxviii, Berlin, 1904, pp 164-191)* A recent collation yields the following corrections to Ruhl's text Line 10 MS. reads *swore*, Ruhl emends to *says* without giving any reason Line 66, for *back* read *blacke* Line 86, for *piece* read *peice*, this is apparently a transposition or a normalized spelling silently inserted. Line 91, for *there* read *here* Line 151, for *performed* read *preferrd* Line 157, for *Epicures* read *Epicures* Line 173, for *Mogulls* read *Magulls*. Line 196, MS has *their rosemarye* crossed out before *theire sory*. Line 224, for *trav'n'd* read *tram'd* Line 259, MS has *throughinge* written at end of line, Ruhl ignores Line 266, for *curvie* read *scurvie*. Line 306, for *myht* read *night*. Line 324, for *swimpering* read *swimpring* Line 429, for *daune* read *daunce* Line 610, for *make* read *marke*. Line 699, for *fine* read *fire* Line 748, Ruhl omits MS *and* between *law* and *manners*. Line 764, lacuna in MS after *of*, with space for a seven or eight letter word Line 789, for *patable* read *potable*. Line 823, for *savour* read *savour* Line 913, there is no need for Ruhl to emend by inserting an auxiliary verb (1 e. *have*). S. d., for *Grobrianus* read *Grobrianum*.

R. H. BOWERS

*St Petersburg Junior College*



## HALLER AND WIELAND

In the August, 1773, number of Wieland's *Teutscher Merkur* an article appeared, entitled "Die Regierungskunst, oder Unterricht eines alten Persischen Monarchen an seinen Sohn Nach dem Englischen," consisting of 20 brief exhortations, followed by 3 lengthy "Zusatze." In spite of the absence of a signature or specific references, it was generally regarded as an attack by Wieland himself on Haller's *Usong*, which had appeared in 1771.

The aging Haller himself, sorely vexed, appealed to his friend Heyne for aid (E. F. Rossler, *Die Grundung der Universität Göttingen*, 1855, p. 372). Haller's most important biographer, Ludwig Hirzel, still saw in this article nothing but a vicious attack, it is "ein Auszug aus dem letzten Kapitel des *Usong*, voll willkürlicher Entstellungen, ohne jede Nennung von Hallers Namen, mit dem blossen Zusatz "Aus dem Englischen." Eine Reihe spottischer Anmerkungen zu den Auszügen folgte. . . ." (*Albrecht von Haller's Gedichte* 1882, p. cdl). Max Widmann in his *Albrecht von Haller's Staatsromane* 1894 (p. 216) concurred. Dr. Bernhard Seuffert saw in 1905 the faint possibility of the existence of an original behind "Nach dem Englischen," but concluded in 1909, that the Zusätze "stammen sicher von Wieland, wahrscheinlich auch der Haupttext" (*Prolegomena zu einer Wieland Ausgabe*, III No. 11 Fussnote, S. 9, Berlin 1905 and *Prolegomena* v No. 221 S. 35, Berlin 1909).

Dr. Wm. Kurrelmeyer thereupon proved, beyond any doubt (in *MLA.*, 38, 1923, p. 869), that the first part of the *Merkur* article was a direct translation of an article in the *Universal Magazine*, London, for January 1773 (v 52, pp. 29 ff.), entitled "The Art of Reigning or the Instructions of a Persian Prince to his Son."

It can now be shown that this *Universal Magazine* article is a patchwork of excerpts from the last part of Book IV (p. 258 ff.) of *Usong, An Eastern Narrative. Written in German By Baron Haller. In Two Volumes London Printed for the Translator, and sold by F. Newberry in Ludgate Street and J. Walter at Charing Cross MDCCLXXII*, the English translation of the first edition of Haller's *Usong*. The circle is now complete.

Five texts must here be dealt with: the first and third editions of Haller's *Usong*, 1771 and 1772; the English *Usong*, 1772, the *Uni-*

*versal Magazine* article and the *Merkur*. The third "verbesserte Ausgabe," 1772, of Haller's *Usony* differs from the first mainly in the addition of a very few explanatory sentences. The last section of the first selection below is the most important example.

The English *Usony* represents, on the whole, a conscientious translation. Even Haller's footnotes are included. Only a few minor changes have been made: insignificant additions for emphasis (as the strengthening of the Haller-*Usony* exhortation against hunting, Haller 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. p. 373,<sup>1</sup> English *Usony* p. 264), slight inaccuracies (as "luscious cates" p. 263 for "edle Fruchte" p. 372). Mistakes through ignorance are rare, as "in one morning" p. 287 for "auf einem Morgen [Land]" p. 386.

The radical change has been made by the author of the *Universal Magazine* article. Evidently a quintessence of the quintessence that Haller had given at the end of his book was intended. The source of the article was concealed, *Usony's* name and all references to things Persian, except in the title, were obliterated. Faced by the problem of compression into magazine limits, the author, however, generally selects what appears to him to be the meaty, salient paragraphs—20 exhortations out of 56 are chosen—and translates these fairly faithfully, as shown below. Now and then he does boil down or abbreviate as in selection II. The completely eliminated paragraphs contain, for instance, 1) repetitions, to a small extent, 2) specific advice concerning military preparations, 3) council contrary to English custom, as the exhortation against hunting. Violence can be said to be done to the spirit of Haller's *Usony* only in the omission of some of Haller's favorite ideas in favor of religion, tolerant religion, and his warning against wealth and display.

This extract, including the generalized title, was taken over bodily by the *Teutscher Merkur*. The minor changes made by the English *Usony* translator go, as a rule, straight through as, for instance, for Haller's "dauerhaftes Ubel" (p. 376), English *Usony* "cankering sore," *Universal Magazine* "cankering sore," *Merkur* "fressender Schaden." Haller's "Gesetze berassen sich" (p. 378) loses its picturesqueness in all three to the same extent, as shown below. Haller's "Pflug" (p. 385) becomes generalized throughout. English *Usony* "tool" (p. 287), *Universal Mag* "tool,"

<sup>1</sup> Page numbers in Haller's *Usony* are, in this article, those of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1772, the edition Haller clearly had in mind in his defense letter.

*Merkur* "Werkzeug" (p 173) Furthermore, slight additions made by the author of the English *Usong* go, as a rule, through the *Universal Magazine* into the *Merkur*, as in the case of the word "basely" in the first selection below, as the English *Usong* (265) "Let no servant suspect that he may deceive thee or be the abettor of unjust proceedings and never be suspected," compared with Haller (p. 374) "Lasz bey keinem Diener die Hoffnung entstehen, er werde das Unrecht dir anrathen konnen, und nicht entdeckt werden."

A few independent changes are, however, also perceptible *Der Teutsche Merkur* is apt to use a more emphatic form of expression than the English as "Gewalt" for "power" in the opening paragraph of the article, for Haller's original "Macht" (p 369), as "Gluckseligkeiten" (p 168) for English "blessings," for Haller's "Gutes" *Der Teutsche Merkur* makes also a few independent additions as (p. 173) "Beschutze die Kaufleute, und beschränke die Freyheit der Handlung nicht durch unnötige Gesetze," compared with the brief English "Protect the merchants" and Haller's "Schutze die Kaufleute" (p 385) There are a few eliminations as p 172, where the English "'Tis thus the enemy of God strives to seduce the just," corresponding to Haller's "du wurdest thun, was der Feind Gottes zu thun sucht, einen Gerechten verführen" (p. 383), disappears.

There are, however, a few other changes which lead one to suspect that the author in the *Teutscher Merkur* may also, at times, have consulted the original text He corrects (p 173) the flagrant mistake "in one morning" of the *Universal Magazine*, which went back to the English *Usong* (p 287), for Haller's "auf einem Morgen [Land]" *Der Merkur* returns in several other instances to the original meaning, if not to the word itself, as in the last sentence of this same "Morgen" paragraph. Again p 169 there is a return "mit keiner Neigung in geheimen Verstandnis steht" instead of English "nothing correspondent to it," for Haller's "kein heimliches Verstandnisz findet" (p 371), and again as "Sinnlichkeit" (p 169) for English "luxury," for Haller's "Wolluste" (p 371). The *Merkur* also omits, as shown below in the first selection, the sentence: "he alienates his people," which the first *Usong* translator had inserted

The following passages from the four main texts are illustrative

## I

Haller's *Usong* 1771, 1772<sup>2</sup> (p 371 of 1772 ed)

Die Tragheit ist eines Fursten groszter Fehler Er verrath sein Volk, er verkauft es, den Musziggang fur sich selbst zu erhandeln, und liefert es in die Hande seiner Diener Er entsagt dem Ruhme, die Quelle des allgemeinen Wohlstandes zu seyn, und erniedriget sich bis zu dem Stande eines Schattens, der einen Mann vorstellt, aber nur fremden Bewegungen folget Unter einem tragen Fursten leiden die Unterthanen mehr als unter einem bosen, weil die Unterdruckung so vieler losgelassenen untern Bedienten sich in die Hutten eines jeden Landmannes erstreckt, und die Wuth eines Tyrannen nur dem Hoflinge gefahrlich ist [Ein arbeitsamer Furst kann niemals ein ganz schlimmer Furst seyn Das Wohlseyn der Unterthanen ist das Wohl des Staates, der des Fursten Erbgut ist Dieses zu befordern wird er, wenn er die Mangel kennt, sich selbst zu Liebe trachten Da er Arbeit liebt, so reissen ihn die Wolluste nicht hin, sein Gluck vom Glucke des Staates zu trennen Seine Untergehen werden nicht mehr das Volk drucken, weil der Furst es sieht, der die Verwuster seines Erbes strafen wurde]

English *Usong* 1772 (p 261)  
and

*Der Teutsche Merkur*, Aug 1773  
(p 169)

*Universal Mag*, Jan 1773<sup>3</sup> (p 29)

Sloth is the greatest failing of a Prince, a slothful Monarch betrays, he alienates his people, he sells it to his servants for the vile consideration of indulging his own ease He basely renounces the glory of being the source of public welfare, and demeans himself even to the condition of a shadow, that represents a man, but is actuated merely by external powers The subject is more wretched under a slothful than under a wicked Prince, The oppression of many inferior substitutes whose extortion is authorized, extends even to the huts of the poor labourers, the fury of a tyrant is only dangerous to the courtiers

Tragheit ist der groszte Fehler eines Fursten Ein trager Regent verrath, verkauft sein Volk, denn er uberlaszt es seinen Dienern um der schlechten Ursache willen, seiner Gemachlichkeit pflegen zu konnen Er entsagt niedertrachtiger weise dem Ruhme, die Quelle der gemeinen Wohlfarth zu seyn, und vernichtet gleichsam sich selbst zu einem Schatten, der zwar einen Menschen vorstellt, aber blos durch fremde Krafte in eine anscheinende Bewegung gesetzt wird Der Unterthan ist unter einem tragen Fursten weit unglucklicher als unter einem bosen Die Unterdruckung so vieler Unterregenten, deren Erpressungen autorisirt sind, erstreckt sich bis auf

<sup>2</sup> The first and third editions of Haller's *Usong* are here given in one, since the third merely repeats the first, adding the final passage enclosed in brackets above

<sup>3</sup> Identical with English *Usong*, except for the spelling of prince and monarch, changed to capitals

*Der Teutsche Merkur*, Aug 1773  
(p 169)

die Hütte des armen Tagelohners  
da hingegen die Wuth eines Tyrannen  
blos seinen Hofleuten gefährlich ist

## II

Haller's *Usong* 1771, 1772<sup>4</sup>  
(p 377 of 1772 ed.)

Verandere die Verfassung von Persien nicht, auch bey den scheinbarsten Gründen, ohne den Rath aller vier Abtheilungen und auch diesen lasz dir unterschrieben geben, und dennoch nimm dir Zeit, den Vorschlag noch einmal zu überlegen. Alle Gesetze berasen sich, und erhalten langsam vom Volke eine Verehrung, die auf ihre Dauerhaftigkeit sich gründet. Neue Gesetze sind ein Gestandnisz, dasz der Gesetzgeber gefehlt hat, und warum sollte er nicht wiederum fehlen können?

*Universal Mag* Jan 1773  
(p 29)

Change not the constitution of thy kingdom in any one point, even on the most specious grounds, without previously consulting the other departments which compose it. Demand their opinions and deliberate. Laws gradually consolidate and acquire the veneration of the people, which is founded upon their permanency. A new law is an avowal that the law-giver has once erred; and why should he not err again?

English *Usong* 1772  
(p 275)

Change not the constitution of the empire, even on the most specious grounds, without previously consulting the four departments demand their opinions under their own hands, and once more maturely deliberate on the proposal. Laws gradually consolidate, and acquire the veneration of the people, which is founded upon their permanency. A new law is an avowal that the lawgiver has once erred and why should he not err again?

*Der Teutsche Merkur* Aug 1773  
(p 171)

Verandere die Staatsverfassung deines Reiches nicht im geringsten Theile, selbst nicht aus den scheinbarsten Gründen, ohne zuvor die übrigen Departements, woraus es besteht, zu Rathe gezogen zu haben. Gesetze gelangen nur nach und nach zur gehörigen Festigkeit, und die Ehrfurcht, welche das Volk für sie heget, gründet sich blos auf ihre Unverletzlichkeit und ewige Dauer. Eine neues Gesetz ist ein Bekenntnisz, dasz der Gesetzgeber einstmals geirrt habe, und kann er sich nicht wiederum irren?

Though the first part of the *Merkur* article is, as may be seen above, a fairly faithful translation of Haller's *Usong*, the second part, the *Zusatze*, originate, as Dr Kurrelmeyer has pointed out,

<sup>4</sup> The third edition of Haller's *Usong* 1772 here identical with first

with Wieland himself. In the form of three lengthy commentaries Wieland here attacks three points in the text. In the first *Zusatz*, which applies to the first selection above, he seeks to refute the thesis that subjects are more miserable under a weak than under a wicked monarch, ridicules the author for his theoretical, general rule and brings in a fictitious MS. to exemplify model treatment of the theme. Wieland lashes, however, mainly contemporary chaotic conditions, existing really as much in Germany as in Switzerland—still with a gibe inserted that might be taken to apply to Haller and Bern.

The second *Zusatz*, referring to selection II above, attacks a rule ("never change a constitution") that had not been laid down. The aged Persian monarch sought utmost stability of government, not the ossification of laws. Wieland wilfully ignores the modifying phrase of the text, "ohne zuvor. . . ." Here again Wieland seems more to utilize the occasion, from behind a safe cover, to satirize against deplorable arbitrary judicial conditions in Germany. And still a personal gibe against Haller might again be seen tucked away inside the diatribe, "Der Persische Monarch (oder vielmehr der ehrliche Mann, der diesen Aufsatz in dessen Nahmen entworfen hat, und der es, von der Hohe seines sechsten Stockwerkes herab, so leicht findet, unveränderliche Gesetze zu geben) . . . scheint vergessen zu haben, dass Menschen dem unvermeidlichen Loos unterworfen sind, sich zuweilen zu irren. . . ."

Again in the third *Zusatz* there would seem to be a wilful misconstruing of the text in order to gain an opportunity to strike out against the criminal perversion of the law through loopholes of technicalities.

The very position of the article in the *Mercur*, following, as it does *Die Wahl des Herkules*, the birthday tribute to the young Storm and Stress Herzog Karl August, probably indicates the idea of a constructive "Fürstenspiegel" more than a mere literary satire.

The surprising thing is that Haller felt the article in its entirety to be an unqualified vicious attack upon himself and his *Usong*. On Nov. 24, 1773 he writes to his friend Heyne in Göttingen:

Nun kommt eine Schwachheit von mir, ich weis nicht ob mich mein verdrieszlicher Zufall mit dem Harne empfindlich macht, der mir gar zu oft den Schlaf wegnimmt, aber der Muthwillen in d. Mercur hat auch alles aufgebracht (III B 1 St.) *Usong* ist als wenn er aus dem Englischen

übersetzt ware, hier wieder übersetzt und spottlich angegriffen Der Verfasser wohne im sechsten Stocke und ein Tyrann könne kein guter Fürst seyn Das war nicht gesagt, wohl aber ein arbeitsamer Fürst könne nicht ganz böse seyn und ein sogenannter guter trager Fürst sey noch ein schlechterer Herr als ein harter Fürst Selbst Kriege zu fuhren, bin ich zu alt, und mich der Gottingischen Anzeigen zu bedienen, ware ungroszmuthig, doch wunschte ich dasz alles gesagt wurde Kann es seyn, so dunckt mich, mir geschehe ein Gefallen Hat es Bedenklichkeiten, so vergessen Ew Wohlgeb, dasz ich geschrieben habe Von den ungerechten Berlinischen und Frankfurtischen Recensionen habe ich nichts sagen wollen " (Em F Rossler, *Die Grundung der Unveerstat Gottingen*, 1885, p 372)

It is highly probable that Wieland was secondarily and slyly satirising the apostle of virtue and frugality Even though Haller had earlier exerted a deep influence on Wieland, as Adolf Frey clearly demonstrates (*Albrecht von Haller und seine Bedeutung fur die deutsche Literatur*, p. 179), later years brought an estrangement Haller's real feelings are evident in another letter to Heyne (Rossler p 372, Dez 26, 1773). The necrology on Haller in Wieland's *Teutscher Merkur* (Jun 1778, p 248) shows, to be sure, genuine esteem, however only the introduction is here by Wieland (Seuffert, *Prolegomena* v, 533, p 70) and in this there are ambiguities

Haller evidently resents three things in the *Merkur* article particularly bitterly In the heading "Aus dem Englischen" Haller evidently sees a veiled insinuation of plagiarism Here it seems almost incredible that he does not recognize and accept his own flesh and blood in the first half of the article, since he was fully aware that his *Usong* had been translated, even though he might not yet have seen the translation (letter in Rossler p 371) In regard to the second point, Haller may be said to be fully justified in resenting the supercilious attitude taken Concerning the third point, Haller was half right and half wrong He seems in his deep resentment to have forgotten that the sentences which he quotes in his defense from his text "Ein arbeitsamer Fürst ." (which comprise the second half of selection I above) were not added before in the 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, 1772, words probably added out of a feeling that the foregoing passage might possibly be open to the very misinterpretation that Wieland gave them

Taken as a whole, Wieland was partly, but only partly justified in his criticism of the old Persian Monarch of his translation. Interpreted by Haller and his friends as a review of *Usong*, it could

not but appear to them as a highly unfair, petty attack Haller's *Usona* had shown himself through 400 pages to be in practise and theory a reformer, though also a conserver of tradition, a diligent self-controlled ruler, who created branches of government that curbed his own power, a ruler who insisted upon the spirit of the law, not on technicalities.

Probably a network of prejudicing factors prevented Haller from seeing through the mystification the example and remembrance of the dastardly literary persecution in a feigned form which he had suffered at the hands of la Mettrie (Ludwig Hirzel, *Albrecht von Hallers Gedichte*, 1882, p. CDL), the recent scathing reviews of *Usona* in the *Allg. deutsche Bibliothek* and in the *Frankfurter gelehrte Anzeigen*, the feeling of secretly taut relations with Wieland, and lastly, his own severe physical sufferings and loneliness.

CAROL K. BANG

Baltimore, Md

# HEXENFEXEN FAUST II, L 6199

After the masquerade at the Emperor's court Faust takes Mephistopheles into the dark corridor and requests him to call up Helen and Paris for the entertainment of the Emperor Mephistopheles sarcastically replies

- 6197 Denkst Helenen so leicht hervorzurufen  
 Wie das Papiergespent der Gulden —  
 Mit Hexen-Fexen, mit Gespenst-Gespinnsten,  
 Kielkropfigen Zwergen steh' ich gleich zu Diensten,  
 Doch Teufels Liebchen, wenn auch nicht zu schelten,  
 6202 Sie können nicht für Heiomen gelten

There are four compounds in this short passage that Goethe uses here for the first time as they are not recorded in German before *Papiergespent*, *Hexen-Fexen*, *Gespent-Gespinnsten*, *Teufels-Liebchen*. They all have a humorous touch. In *Hexen-Fexen* and *Gespent-Gespinnsten* Mephistopheles is evidently playing with the sound of the words. They are the only two compounds that need comment and explanation.

Heyne in the *DWB* takes *Hexenfexen* as the plural of the masculine noun *Hexenfex* and explains it as 'hexenhafter Possenreisser'. Strehle's *Wörterbuch zu Goethes Faust* (Stuttgart 1891) repeats



this explanation Under *Fex* the *DWb* refers to *Fachs* m which in Upper German dialects has the meaning 'nugator, scurra,' but also 'blodsinnig, cretin' This interpretation has been substantially accepted by nearly all Faust commentators. Duntzer's suggestion that *Hexenfexen* stands for *Hexenfazen*, "der Dichter scheint diese Form gewählt zu haben, um den letzten Teil der Zusammensetzung an den ersten mehr anklingen zu lassen" (*Kommentar*, 2nd ed, Leipzig 1857, p 484) has found little favor and rightly so. In the 3rd edition of his *Erläuterungen zu den deutschen Klassikern* (Leipzig 1879) he is somewhat more explicit "Statt Hexenfexen erwartet man Hexenfazen, aber der Dichter wollte den 2 Teil wie in Gespenstgespinnsten mehr an den ersten anklingen lassen An Fex in der Bedeutung eines albernen Menschen oder Narren (wie auch in Narrenfex) ist hier nicht zu denken" Moriz Ehlrich in his *Faust* edition (Berlin 1888, 8th ed) explains *Hexenfexen* as *Hexenpossen* but adds "Fex ist ein alberner Tropf oder Possenreisser" His attempt to combine Duntzer's explanation with that of the *DWb* results in confusion. M Pospischil, *Erläuterungen zu Goethes Faust*, Hamburg 1900, p 19, following Duntzer gives 'Hexenfazen- Hexen-Possen' Erich Bischoff, *Erläuterungen zu Goethes 'Faust'* (in W Königs *Erläuterungen zu den Klassikern*, vol 21, p. 49) gives 'Hexenfazen Hexen-Narren, komische Gespenster' Kluge-Goetze's *Etym Wb* cites the word under *Fex* m cretin, also Weigand<sup>5</sup>

But what sense is there in the statement 'mit hexenhaften Possenreissern (or mit hexenhaften Blodsinnigen) steh ich zu Diensten?' It is true one of the old implications of the word *Hexe* is that of *Possenreisser*, *scurra* (cf. *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens* III, 1835) but the most striking characteristic of the witches both in the Northern and in the Classical *Walpurgisnacht* is their sexual attractiveness Heyne's interpretation in the *DWb* connecting *Fexen* with the Bavarian-Austrian 'der Fex,' 'cretin' emphasizes the ugliness and the ridiculousness of these creatures Faust commentators following the interpretation of the *DWb* also stress this point Schroer says "Hexenfex ist eine lacherliche Hexengestalt" Calvin Thomas suggests the translation 'witch-monstrosities' i e revolting witches but admits that the meaning is a little uncertain Witkowski (9th ed) repeats the interpretation of the *DWb* *Fex* = cretin "hier wegen des abstossenden Ausseren als hassliches Teufelserzeugnis." But to

Mephistopheles the witches are neither monstrosities nor even ugly. Faust himself has found them entertaining and attractive on the Brocken. It is hardly conceivable that Mephistopheles should refer to his witches as cretins, repulsive and feeble-minded, even in a humorous and ironic passage as the one under consideration. Two lines later he says "Doch Teufelsliebchen, wenn auch nicht zu schelten, Sie können nicht für Heroinen gelten." 'The sweethearts of the devil, though no fault is to be found with them, cannot be considered Greek heroines.' It would be a senseless contradiction on the part of Mephistopheles to praise the witches here after referring to them as ugly and feeble-minded cretins two lines before. *Fexen* in l 6199 cannot mean *cretins* and hence cannot be a form of *der Fex, cretin* or *scurra*.

Before continuing this discussion let us consider the compound *Gespent-Gespinnst*. It consists of two nouns which here have practically the same meaning, even though they are etymologically unrelated. If we compare the meanings given in the *DWb* for *Gespent* with those given for *Gespinnst*, we could hardly reach the conclusion that the two words were ever used in exactly the same sense even though they approach in meaning at times. But semantic identity may be established if we compare the two compounds *Hirngespent* and *Hirngespinnst* frequently found in the 18th century. The former corresponds to the English 'phantom of the brain,' the latter to 'cobweb of the brain.' *Hirngespinnst* is found in the early part of the 18th century, it is recorded in Ludwig's *Deutsch-englisches Wörterbuch* (1716), but the underlying idea 'das Hirn spinnt' is found in the 17th century (Cf *DWb* s. v. *Hirn* 4) c) and Weigand<sup>5</sup>). *Hirngespent* arose in the 18th century, it is a favorite word of Wieland and is also frequently used by Kant. The numerous examples given in the *DWb* for *Hirngespinnst* and *Hirngespent* show that in a large number of cases, perhaps the majority of cases, there was no difference of meaning between the two words. Olof Lind's *Deutsch-Schwedisches Lexicon* (Stockholm 1749, col. 948) gives the two forms 'Hirn-Gespent oder Gespinnst' as the equivalent of the Swedish 'fantasering.' The semantic identity of the two words may have suggested to some an identity of etymological origin, but Adelung correctly connects *Gespent* with *spanen* of the older language, Schroer on the other hand in his edition of *Faust* (1881) derives both from *spanen*.

If *Gespenst-Gespinnsten* is a compound consisting of two nouns identical in meaning, a sort of dvandva compound, it is fair to assume that *Hexenfexen* is a similar compound and that the second part *Fexen* has the same meaning as the first part *Hexen*. *Gespenst-Gespinnsten* also implies the unreality of what Mephistopheles is able to offer in keeping with the romantic irony Mephistopheles displays elsewhere in the poem.

Only one passage in literary German has been found so far in which the form *die Fexe* occurs. It is in Albrecht von Haller's review of Lessing's *Laokoon* published in the *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1766, p. 903. The review is reprinted in Haller's *Tagebuch*, Bern 1787, I, 278. The passage reads "von dieser Art ist die Perle, die von einer *Fexe* an das Ohr einer jeden Schlüsselblume bey dem Shakespear angehangt wird". The reference is to *A Midsummer Night's Dream* II, 1 where the fairy says "I must hang a pearl in every cowslip's ear". Haller's *Fexe* corresponds to Shakespeare's *fairy*, Wieland uses here *Fee*, Schlegel *Elfe*.

E. L. Rochholz in an article 'Mundartliche Namen des Cretinismus' (*Ztsch. f. dtsch. Philol.* III, 331 ff. 1871) discusses this passage. *Fex*, he states, is the generally accepted name for cretin in the Upper German dialects by the side of *cretin*. "Seine Heimat sind die romanischen und rätischen Hochalpen der Schweiz, Tirols, Steiermarks und Karthens". Während dies Wort nun schon längst ein *genus commune* geworden ist, wird es im Salzburger Unter-Inntal noch nach beiden Geschlechtern unterschieden: der *Fècks*, die *Fègkin*. Albrecht von Haller hat diesem mundartlichen Feminin eine hochdeutsche Form zu geben gesucht, und bringt dasselbe zugleich mit dem Feenwesen in Verbindung, welches im romanischen Volksglauben als Veranlasser des Cretinenzustandes gilt". After quoting the passage<sup>1</sup> from Haller's review Rochholz continues: "Jeder Leser sieht, dass mit diesem Feminin nicht mehr die blodsinnige, sondern die zauberische Nymphe gemeint ist, die dem romanischen Sprachgebiete ausschliesslich angehörende *fee*."

<sup>1</sup>In the quotation as given by Rochholz the word *Fewe* is followed by *Elfe* in parenthesis. Rochholz was evidently under the impression that Haller had himself placed *Elfe* in parenthesis to explain *Fexe*, but neither the *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen* nor Haller's *Tagebuch* contain the parenthesis. Rochholz's immediate source was *Lessings Leben und Werke* by Danzel and Guhrauer, where the editors had inserted *Elfe* in parenthesis to explain *Fexe*.

Aus eben diesem gebiete wird Haller seine auffallende wortform entlehnt haben, sie ist ihm durch das patois des Waatlandes und des ans Unterwallis angrenzenden Freiburgerlandes vermittelt zugekommen, in diesen damals noch unter Bern stehenden landesteilen hatte er seinen offeren aufenthalt genommen, später seine amtliche stellung gefunden Hier hat bis heute der feenglaube ausgedauert in zahlreichen lokalsagen, welche in Vuillemin's schrift *Canton Waat* und in Heinr Runge's monographie *Die feen in der Schweiz* gesammelt stehen."

Unfortunately Rochholz gives no direct references for the use of the word in the "romanischen und rhatischen Hochalpen der Schweiz" A careful search of the two volumes of Vuillemin's *Der Kanton Waat* (St Gallen and Bern 1849) shows no trace of the word *Fexe*. Runge's monograph *Die Feen in der Schweiz*<sup>2</sup> I have not been able to obtain The *Schweizerische Idiotikon* refers to Haller's use of *Fete* and to Rochholz's article, but does not record any other example of the use of the word as masculine or as feminine In dictionaries and glossaries of French-Swiss patois I have not been able to find an example of *Fex(e)* In the Romansch dictionary of A Velleman<sup>3</sup> 'Val Fex' is recorded as the name of a valley in Upper Engadin and *Fex* as name of several groups of houses in the Val Fex No explanation is given but it is not impossible that the valley was named after the "zauberische Nympe" mentioned by Rochholz

But there is clear evidence that the feminine *Fex* was used in the Austro-Bavarian dialect in the sense of witch The masculine

<sup>2</sup> It seems very doubtful that Runge's monograph *Die Feen in der Schweiz* was ever published The *Dictionnaire Historique et Biographique de la Suisse* (Neuchâtel 1930) does not record the work in its bibliography of Heinrich Runge's writings Nor is it recorded in the obituary notice of Heinrich Runge published in the *Anzeiger für schweizerische Geschichte*, 1887, p 87, where all the works of Runge dealing with Switzerland are given H Prohle in his sketch of Heinrich Runge's life in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* says "H Runge sammelte die Sagen der Schweiz, und die Schweizersagen in Prohles *Deutschen Sagen* (2 Aufl 1879) sind fast ganz diesem ungedruckt gebliebenen Werke entnommen" Among Runge's published works Prohle does not mention *Die Feen der Schweiz*

<sup>3</sup> Anton Velleman, *Ladinsches Notwörterbuch mit deutscher, französischer und englischer Übersetzung Abridged Dictionary of the Ladin (or Romansch) Language with German, French and English Translation* Sameden 1929

*Fex* in the sense of cretin is characteristic for the Austro-Bavarian dialect Carl Loritza's *Neues Idioticon Viennense* (Wien, 1847) records 'Fex (die) gleichbedeutend mit Hex z B geh, du alte Fex' It is also found in Fr S Hugel, *Der Wiener Dialekt Lexikon der Volkssprache* (Wien Pest Leipzig 1873) 'Fex, eine Hexe, auch ein Trottel, ein Idiot' Weigand<sup>5</sup> cites Loritza but *Hexenfexen* he connects with *Fex*, masc, in the sense of cretin It is clear that *Fex* 'witch' and *Fex* 'cretin' are etymologically identical, the mysteriousness and the ugliness of the cretins suggested witchcraft, but it is wrong and misleading to translate and to explain the second part of *Hexenfexen* with *Possenreisser*, feeble-minded, cretin or with anything else than witch

Whether Haller got his *Fexe* from an Alemannic source not elsewhere recorded or from the Austro-Bavarian, it need not surprise us that he rendered Shakespeare's fairy with a word meaning witch Before Wieland had introduced *Elfe* into German, German authors were hard put to it to find a satisfactory translation for the English 'fairy' or 'elves' They frequently render it with 'Hexen' In Thomson's *Seasons*, 'Summer' l 1095 'the fairy people' is rendered by Brockes (1745) and by Tobler (1764) with 'der Hexen Schaar' In the German translation of *Clarissa Harlowe* (Göttingen 1753, VIII 5) we read es müssen doch wohl, wie man sagt, die Hexen (in the original 'fairies') allzeit bei der Hand sein, den Verliebten zu helfen (Of the article Fei, Fee- Elfe in *Zt f dtsh Wortforschung* xiv 203 where other examples may be found.)

*Fex* in the sense of witch does not seem to be entirely unknown in modern High German, at least Muret-Sanders' *Enzyklopädisches Deutsch-Englisches Wörterbuch* records *Fex* as a rarely used weak feminine in the sense of 'Hexe' by the side of the weak masculine der *Fex* in the sense of 'fool'

In Dutch we find the word *feex* formerly used at times in the sense of witch Matthias Kramer's *Nider-Hoch-Teutsch und Hoch-Nider-Teutsch Dictionarium*, Nurnberg 1719, Appendix p. 286 records *Feex* as 'Hex, Zauberin', 'zy is en booze Feex, sie ist eine bose Hexe' In the German-Dutch part we find under Hex 'Heks, Hex, Feex, Duivel-jaagster' But the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* does not recognize this meaning at all The relation of Dutch *feeks* to Upper German *Fex* is obscure

Goethe had doubtless read Haller's review of Lessing's *Laokoon* and the strange word *Fexe* may have clung to his memory until,

late in life, it emerged as the appropriate rhyming word for his humorous compound Hexenfexen, but he may also have heard the Bavarian-Austrian dialect word for witch

It is interesting to note that some of the English and American translators have caught the meaning of the word better than the German Faust commentators. They felt instinctively that Mephistopheles was not thinking of cretins, monstrosities or feeble-minded fools but of witches always dear to him. Miss Anna Swanwick translates (London 1879) 'With wizard witchery, or ghostly ghost,/ Or goitered dwarf, I'm ready at my post'. Excellent is W. H. van der Smissen's rendering (London-Toronto 1926 p. 192) 'With witchy witches or with ghosties ghostly/ And goitred goblins I can serve you mostly'. The humorous touch of the original is preserved in the English. George M. Priest also avoids the pitfall of cretinism (New York, 1932) 'With witches' witchery and ghostly ghost,/ With changeling dwarfs I'm ready at my post'.

JOHN A. WALZ

*Harvard University*

---

## LICHTENBERGS VORTRAG ÜBER DIE CHARAKTERE IN DER GESCHICHTE UND SEIN GESAMTWERK

Die Schriften Georg Christoph Lichtenbergs, von denen Goethe sagte, man könne sich ihrer "als der wunderbarsten Wunschelrute bedienen, wo er einen Spass macht, liegt ein Problem verborgen" haben noch keine umfassende Darstellung gefunden, teils wohl infolge der Unübersichtlichkeit des weithin verstreuten Materials, teils wegen des Fehlens einer rasch einleuchtenden "Entwicklung" oder auch nur einer leicht darstellbaren Einheit seines Wesens. Man kennt auch höchstens die Aphorismen, die Parodie auf Lavater und die Briefe aus England. Sonst sind die Prosaschriften fast völlig vergessen. Sie sind aber für das Verständnis des Wesens dieses Mannes, ja selbst des inneren Zusammenhanges der Aphorismen und so ihrer selbst fast unentbehrlich.

Die meisten seiner ihn ein Leben lang beherrschenden Themen und die Jahrzehnte lang fortwirkenden Grundformen seines Denkens lassen sich schon in den ersten uns bekannten Notizheften erken-

nen<sup>1</sup> Wie eine zweite Spiegelung seiner Eigenart, wie ein bewussteres Programm seiner späteren Wirksamkeit stellt sich uns seine erste erhaltene zusammenhängende Niederschrift dar, der Entwurf zum Vortrag über die Charaktere in der Geschichte.

Am 25. Oktober 1764 war eine Anzahl Göttinger Dozenten zu einer historischen Akademie zusammengetreten, die auch Studenten als Beisitzer oder ausserordentliche Mitglieder aufnahm.<sup>2</sup> Ein Vierteljahr nach der Gründung hielt vor ihr der junge Student der Mathematik und Physik Lichtenberg jenen Vortrag, der nach seinen Worten eine Idee auseinandersetzte, die er sich damals von der vollkommenen Schilderung eines Charakters in einer Geschichtserzählung machte.<sup>3</sup>

Dieser Vortrag ist in der versuchten Konzentration bewussterer Denkarbeit als die ersten Notizen, denn er sammelt Lichtenbergs verstreute Ideen auf einen Gegenstand, die Aufgaben des Geschichtsschreibers. Nicht ganz bewusst aber ist er sich des inneren Sinnes dessen, was sich hier abspielte. Der Verfasser spricht hier das erste Mal sein ihm ein Leben lang beherrschendes Streben nach Kenntnis und Verständnis des Menschen aus. Dass er dieses gerade für den Geschichtsschreiber als notwendig begründete, empfinden wir heute als Zufall, und auch er deutet derartiges an.

Die Eigenschaften, die ich vorhin genannt habe, sind diejenigen, die jeder besitzen soll, der die Welt mit Erfolg lehren will, er mag Geschichtsschreiber, Poet, Rechtsgelehrter, Redner oder Arzt sein, und sie sind auch zu allen Zeiten die unterscheidende Züge grosser Schriftsteller gewesen.

Wir wissen, dass in Lichtenberg um jene Zeit der Plan eines psychologischen Romans entstand.

Mit dem Grundthema seines Lebens, Menschenkenntnis, offenbart sich auch seine Grundhaltung. Skepsis gegenüber allem Wissen, eine Skepsis aber, die nicht die Hände in den Schoß sinken lässt, sondern die zu immer neuem tatigem und rücksichtslosem Forschen, Denken, Überprüfen antreibt. Sie ist Ausgangspunkt des Vortrags. Die Charaktere der Geschichte, wie sie waren, seien nicht unbedingt

<sup>1</sup> Vgl. einen demnächst in den PMLA erscheinenden Aufsatz Zur Frage der Selbständigkeit seiner Notizen siehe meinen Hinweis "LICHTENBERGS PM" in *Dichtung und Volkstum* 1936 (Ich bereite eine Lichtenberg-Biographie vor.)

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. A. Leitzmann, *Lichtenbergs Nachlaß*, S. 183.

<sup>3</sup> S. *Lichtenbergs Nachlaß*, S. 3 ff.

gleichzusetzen jenen, die uns geschildert werden. Wollte man diese kennen, so müsse man erst mit der Verfassung des Geschichtsschreibers vertraut sein und wissen, ob er die nötigen Kenntnisse habe. Das grosse Thema, das der Titel angibt, wird also sofort verkleinert (Zerfallung und Spezialisierung seiner Themen aus Gewissenhaftigkeit, Witten des Problemreichtums und Interesse am minutösen Detail sollte stets Lichtenbergs Art bleiben) und dies so herausgeschaltete besondere Thema, statt in einer Vorlesung erledigt zu werden, wird auf deren drei aufgeteilt. Nur die Niederschrift der ersten, der "allgemeinen," ist erhalten.

Aufklärerisch und echt lichtenbergisch zugleich soll dann von verschiedenen "besonderen Gesichtspunkten" aus der "Nutzen" einer solchen Unternehmung dargetan werden und was man später Befriedigung "zweckfreien wissenschaftlichen Interesses" nennt, heisst hier sehr einfach Befriedigung [geographischer und geschichtlicher] Neugier. In Beurteilung der Unternehmung komme es an auf "die natürliche Geschichte eines Reiches" und das Genie, d. h. die Geistesart, einer Nation. Grosse Manner seien "nichts als grosse Charaktere der Lander und ihrer Bewohner," ihre Schilderungen nichts als Teile einer noch wenig bearbeiteten Naturgeschichte, nämlich der Naturgeschichte vom menschlichen Herzen. In ein paar Satzen ist so Lichtenberg vom Sprungbrett der Geschichte bei dem immer zentralen Gegenstand seines Denkens angelangt. (Aus ihm entwickeln sich ja auch bald seine Plane zur Autobiographie, zur Lebensgeschichte des sonderbaren Kauzes Kunkel, Antiquais in Göttingen, und zum Roman *Christoph Seng*.) Tiefblickend erkennt der 22jährige, dass das Entscheidende im Leben durch den Charakter bestimmt ist und begründet dies exakt

Die gnaue Verbindung unserer Gesinnungen mit unsern Handlungen, und dieser letzteren mit unsern Begebenheiten, macht, dass das Portrait einer Seele zugleich ein Plan ihres Lebens und ihrer ganzen Geschichte ist

So werde das Seelenbildnis, von einem grossen Künstler gezeichnet, wichtiger als alle Lebensbeschreibungen und bisweilen ein Inbegriff von den Begebenheiten eines Staates und ein Auszug aus der Menge von Triebfedern, die ganzen Weltteilen eine andere Gestalt geben können. In der Seele Julius Caesars liege der Grund jahrhundertelanger geschichtlicher und geographischer Veränderungen. Und schon hier erfolgt der erste seiner unzähligen Angriffe auf kompilatorisches, geistloses Gelehrtentum, in einem Satze, der dadurch



echter Lichtenberg ist, dass Ernst unmerklich in Scherz übergeht, doch so, dass mit ernster Miene die Scherzhaftigkeit abgeleugnet werden konnte:

da man heutzutage schon anfangt zu verlangen, dass jedes Buch eine Abbildung der körperlichen Eigenschaften seines Verfassers enthalten soll, der sehr oft nicht so viel Anteil an seinem Buch hat, als Caesar an der heutigen Verfassung des deutschen Reichs

Und gleich darauf wieder eine angesichts der Vorliebe der Zeit für teleologische Betrachtungen unentscheidbar zwischen Ernst und Scherz schillernde Feststellung, gleichfalls sichtlich als verblüffender einzelner, "aphoristischer" Einfall entstanden und hier eingefügt

Wir wundern uns über das hohe Alter der Erzväter, wenn man aber die Erweiterung unserer Erkenntnis, und die Besserung unserer Seele für den Endzweck unsers Lebens ansieht, so hatten sie Ursache, ein längeres Leben zu verlangen als wir, denn wir haben den Unterricht der Geschichte, und wer sich desselben als Philosoph bedient, hat allzeit schon ein halbes Jahrtausend gelebt, auch wenn er in seinem 40sten stirbt

Angesichts der vorgestellten Aufgabe, ein Seelengemälde zu entwerfen, regt sich die Ahnung von einem der entscheidendsten und—soweit wir sehen—von der Forschung völlig unbeachteten Erlebnisse in Lichtenbergs Gedankenwelt der Entdeckung der Ganzheitspsychologie, bestimmt, an die Stelle einer Psychologie—mehr Seelentheorie als Seelenkunde—zu treten, die isolierte Eigenschaften willkürlich miteinander verbindet

Sie [die Proportion in den Seelengemälden] ist wirklich da, und unsere guten Handbücher der Sittenlehre sind die Zeichenbücher, wo die einzelnen Teile oft mit vielem Glück entworfen sind, die aber vielleicht ebensowenig schon in einer Verbindung existiert haben, als die Glieder des Vatikanischen Apolls. Die Regeln dieser Zeichenkunst sind freilich trotz unsrer unzähligen moralischen Schriften noch nicht tief genug untersucht

Welche Fähigkeiten sind nun erforderlich, um ein solches Seelengemälde anzufertigen? Nur ein wahres philosophisches Genie sei dazu umstand, gebildet nicht durch Logik, sondern durch "eigene" [d. h. selbständige] Betrachtung. Eine beständige Aufmerksamkeit auf sich selbst, ein tiefes Nachdenken über die Begebenheiten, worunter ich auch die gemeinsten rechne, und über die kleinsten Triebfedern der menschlichen Handlungen . . ." Das ist von Anfang bis Ende eine Beschreibung von Lichtenbergs eigenem

Denkleben das für die ganze Aufklärung wichtige, sein privates Dasein als Schriftsteller aber geradezu beherrschende Thema der Autonomie des Denkens ist hier ebenso angedeutet wie seine Lieblingsbeschäftigung, die Selbstbeobachtung, der aphoristisch in weite Fernen führende Ausgang vom unbedeutenden Einzelnen<sup>4</sup> ebenso wie seine bald durch ihre Gegenstände, bald durch ihre Methode mikrologische Psychologie. Bloss der gleichfalls geforderte "Umgang mit Leuten von allerlei Stand und Alter" fehlte ihm noch, das Wissen von dieser Notwendigkeit zeigt seine unvoreingenommene Einsicht. Sie führt dazu daß er aus ihr bald einen Programmpunkt seiner Lebensführung macht. Ebenso notwendig für jeden, "der die Welt mit Erfolg lehren will," sei "eine durch lange Übung erlangte Fertigkeit in der Mienen-Kenntnis" das Lieblingsthema seiner 70er Jahre, die Physio-oder Pathognomik taucht auf, ziemlich an den Haaren herbeigezogen und schon mit der charakteristischen, vielleicht unbewussten Verwendung des Wortes "Mienen-" und nicht mehr "Gesichtskenntnis". Dies war ja später sein Hauptgedanke, dass Physiognomik sich mit den im Gesicht dauernd gewordenen Ergebnissen der Mienen, nicht mit den Konstanten des Ausdrucks, wie Schädelbau, Nasenform u. s. w. zu befassen habe.

So wie die Eigenschaften, die der Geschichtsschreiber haben solle, jene sind, die Lichtenberg bei sich selbst kultiviert, so warnt er vor einer Gefahr, die ihn selbst dauernd bedrohte, vor der "Leidenschaft, durch Witz glänzen zu wollen". "Die Macht des Witzes über die Meinung [= den Gedanken], beide in einerlei Person genommen, ist wohl mehr gefühlt als gesagt worden." Diese Formulierung klingt an den Titel eines Buches an, den Lichtenberg sich damals notierte: *Michaelis' Beantwortung der Frage von dem Einfluss der Meinungen in die Sprache und der Sprache in die Meinungen*, Berlin 1760 (A 21, Anm. in Leitzmanns Ausgabe der Aphorismen). In der Tat hatten damals Lichtenbergs sprachkritische Interessen schon eingesetzt. Leibniz' Bemühungen um eine "Characteristica universalis," eine Art internationaler wissenschaftlicher Sprache, die, frei von nationalen Färbungen, logischen Begriffen folgt, machten grossen Eindruck auf ihn. Die dritte Eintragung in seinem ersten erhaltenen Notizheft lautet:

Um eine allgemeine Charakteristik zustande zu bringen, müssen wir erst

---

<sup>4</sup>s meine Arbeit "Der Aphorismus als literarische Form," *Zs f Aesthetik und Kunstwissenschaft*, 1933, S. 154 und passim

von der Ordnung in der Sprache abstrahieren, die Ordnung ist eine gewisse Musik, die wir festgesetzt und die in wenigen Fällen (z. B. *femme sage, sage femme*) einen sonderbaren Nutzen hat. Eine solche Sprache, die den Begriffen folgt, müssen wir erst haben, oder wenigstens für besondere Fälle suchen, wenn wir in der Charakteristik fortkommen wollen. So wird eine solche Sprache ebenso schwer sein zu entwerfen, als die andere, die daraus gefolgert werden soll.

In seiner Sprachbetrachtung ist er in dieser Zeit noch ganz Rationalist und scheut vor der zeugenden Kraft der Wörter zurück. Eine Analogie zum Einfluss der Sprachen auf die "Meinung" hat sich ihm hier eröffnet. Zu ihr komme "der Einfluss des Mechanischen in der Schreibart," nämlich die unwillkürliche Verfälschung der Wahrheit durch Verlockungen des Stils, wie Antithesen, symmetrischen Aufbau und Abrundung der Perioden (Man erinnert sich hier der Worte des anderen grossen Mathematikers, Aphoristikers und Wahrheitssuchers, Pascal, über die *fausses fenêtres pour la symétrie*, Pascals, der mit solcher Macht die Antithese verwendete, wo sie Ausdruck echten antithetischen Denkens und antithetischer Weltanschauung ist.) Wirklich verlassen ungezwungener Sprechton und Natürlichkeit Lichtenberg nur in jenen Gattungen, die ihm nicht lagen, wie in den Romanfragmenten. Experimentell (!) hat der in die Literatur verschlagene junge Physiker versucht, diese Verfälschung zu beweisen, indem er ein Stück aus Guicciardini in eine solche "Grammatische Musik" setzte. In den Notizheften nahm er den Gedanken bald wieder auf.

Der Einfluss des Stils auf unsere Gesinnungen und Gedanken, von dem ich an einem andern Ort geredet habe, zeigt sich sogar bei dem sonst genauen Linnaeus, er sagt, die Steine wachsen, die Pflanzen wachsen und leben, die Tiere wachsen, leben und empfinden, das erste ist falsch, denn das Wachstum der Steine hat keine Ähnlichkeit mit dem Wachstum der Tiere und Pflanzen. (A22)

Außer solchen Metaphern sei eine ganz spezifische Gefahr bei Charakterschilderungen noch die Unbestimmtheit der Wörter, mit denen die Eigenschaften der Seele bezeichnet werden. Denn man sei in der Analyse des menschlichen Gemüts noch nicht sehr weit gekommen und die Eigenschaftsbezeichnungen seien sozusagen nur Geschlechtsnamen, die noch sehr viele Gattungen unter sich begreifen. Nicht nur, dass es keine wirklichen Synonyme gibt—sie bezeichnen in Wirklichkeit verschiedene Species einer und derselben Gattung. Aber auch zu den vorhandenen Wörtern, die keine ver-

meintlichen Synonyma neben, oder unter sich haben, mussten noch Species gefunden werden. Da es so viele Regungen in uns gibt, die feiner sind als unsere Worte, borgen wir Worte und zugleich mit ihnen Begriffe, die über das Ganze eine Ungewissheit verbreiten, die erst schwinden werde, bis ein La Bruyère und noch ein grosserer als er die Seele in einem Wörterbuch erklären werde. Worauf Lichtenberg als Physiker später immer Gewicht legte, auf Verfeinerung der Untersuchungsmethoden, Verbesserung der Instrumente, das verlangte er hier für die Geisteswissenschaft: Verfeinerung der Begriffe, dadurch Verfeinerung (= Spezialisierung) der Wörter. Diese neuen Instrumente konnten dann getreue Bilder der geschichtlichen Wirklichkeit entwerfen.

Damit bricht die erste Vorlesung ab, die zweite und dritte sind nicht erhalten, vermutlich brachte nach dieser allgemeinen Einleitung die zweite Besonderes zur Physiognomik, die dritte Erläuterungen zur geistvollen und fruchtbaren Kreuzung aus Sprachkritik und energischer Mikropsychologie, mit dieser Kritik der Sprache aber schon Kritik der Geschichte.

Man ahnt schon angesichts dieses ersten Vortrags, wie schwer Lichtenberg sich jedes einzelne Urteil machte und warum er trotz genialer Einsichten in Sachliches so oft wie ein erfolglos bemühter Wissenschaftsmethodiker und grundsätzlicher Erkenntniskritiker wirkt, der nie ein im landläufigen (wissenschaftlichen oder literarischen) Sinn grosses Unternehmen vollendete, das die Gegenstände der Wissenschaft selbst behandelt hatte oder unmittelbar eine literarische Darstellung gewesen wäre. Wir sind hier absichtlich der unsystematisch lockeren Gedankenverknüpfung in Lichtenbergs Untersuchung gefolgt, die vielleicht bloss die Zusammenfügung einiger seiner innerlich zusammengehörigen Lieblingsideen ist. Denn dieser Mangel an Systematik im äusseren Aufbau schon seiner Erstlings-Schrift lässt beispielhaft erkennen, warum sein ganzes Werk irrig oft nur als Fülle geistreicher Einzelbeobachtungen aufgefasst und gewertet wurde und nicht als Ausdruck einer einheitlichen, persönlich durchgeformten Weltanschauung.

FRANZ H. MAUTNER

A NOTE ON THE *LAZARILLO DE TORMES*

Practically the whole of the fifth chapter of the *Lazarillo* in the Antwerp and Burgos editions of 1554 is taken up by the story of the *buldero* and the *alguazil*, one single incident, for which a source has been found in the *Novellino* of Tommaso Guardato, better known as Masuccio Salernitano, who wrote his tales at the court of Naples in the years after 1460 and first gathered them in 1476<sup>1</sup>. The story in question is summed up as follows in Settembrini's edition<sup>2</sup>:

Fra Girolamo da Spoleto con un osso di corpo morto fa credere al popolo Sorrentino sia il braccio di Santo Luca il compagno gli dà contra lui prega Iddio che ne dimostri miracolo il compagno finge cascar morto, ed esso orando lo ritorna in vita, e per li doppi miracoli raduna assai moneta, diventane prelato, e col compagno poltroneggia.

The fifth chapter of the *Lazarillo* is one of the most individually marked of the whole book. Who can forget the *alguazil*'s well-timed entrance into the church *en lo mejor del sermon*, his kneeling in prayer and rising to accuse his secret partner *con voz alta y pausada* (p. 233), and the *echacuervo*'s superb prayer for the Lord's intervention *de rodillas en el pulpito y puestas las manos y mirando al cielo* (p. 235), evidently *transportado en la divina esencia* (p. 238), awakening at last from his contemplation *como quien despierta de vn dulce sueño* (p. 239) only to plunge once more into a prayer, this time of intercession, with eyes again raised to heaven *que casi nada se le parescia sino vn poco de blanco*. No one reading this chapter attentively can fail to recognize the touch of a story-teller and an artist. But its only known possible source is also the work of an artist, and its elaboration shows as strongly the imprint of Masuccio as the *Lazarillo* that of its unknown creator.

Readers of the Italian *novella* will easily remember Brother Girolamo and his confederate Mariano, *non meno sufficiente artista di lui* (p. 56), in their thoroughly localized Southern Italian setting, the show of reverence and awe with which the 'relic,' in the light of flickering torches, is opened by a master showman *con gli occhi pieni di lacrime* (p. 59 f.), a showman who is too clever to

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Lazarillo de Tormes*, ed. Cejador, Madrid, 1914, p. 242 f.

<sup>2</sup> Napoli, 1874, p. 53.

seem unperturbed by the public accusation, but who *mostratosi alquanto turbato* (p. 61) and *posto con la mano silenzio al popolo che continuo mormorava, e veduto brevemente ognuno attento a ciò che dir voleva, rivoltosi verso l'altare maggiore ove un' immagine del crocifisso stava, e a quello ingnocchiatosi, con molte lacrime così prese a dire. . . .* A talented narrator is evidently at work here, dramatizing each carefully reported speech, keeping an eye on actors, crowd and background, quick with realizing detail: thus when the accomplice has been revived Fra Girolamo, *con difficoltà non piccola in sul pergolo rimontato*, watches the gifts piling up and in good time, *dato un cauto segno ai compagni*, devoutly departs. In short, the *novella* and the fifth chapter of the *Lazarillo*, differing in many details, and with no more in common than the story in barest outline, are both such artistically different recreations that it is almost impossible to consider one as the source of the other.

However, about the year 1450 there was published in Germany a book of warning against beggars and vagabonds entitled *Die Basler Betrugnisse der Gylen*<sup>3</sup> the substance of which in later versions became known as the *Liber vagatorum* and appeared in a Lower Rhenish, a Low German and a Flemish translation. The Flemish version only is of interest in our discussion. Its earliest extant edition, preserved in an exceedingly rare, perhaps unique copy, was printed in Antwerp in 1563 with the title *Der Flielen / Rabauwen / oft der Schalcken Vocabulaer / ooc de beueysde manieren der bedeleeren oft bedelerssen . . .*, and with the colophon *Ghedruct Thantwerpen by Jan de Laet in die Rape Anno M D Lxiii [r. Lxii]*. The approbation, however, is dated Brussels, September 31, 1547, and presumably there was an edition in that year, but no record or copy of it appears to have survived. The edition of 1563 was reprinted in Antwerp in 1917 (given in the book as 1914) by V de Meyere and L Bakelmans, under the title *Het Boek der Rabauwen en Naaktridders* (now out of print) and more recently, with a reduced facsimile of five pages, in J. G. Moormann's *De Geheimtalen (Bronnenboek)*, Zutphen, 1934, pp. 9-76<sup>4</sup>. In this

<sup>3</sup> Cf F. Chr. Avé Lallemand, *Das Deutsche Gaunerthum*, Leipzig, I (1938) 136 ff. and F. Kluge, *Rotwelsch Quellen und Wortschatz der Gaunersprache und verwandten Geheimsprachen*, Strassburg, I (1901) p. 55, *Anhang*.

<sup>4</sup> Kluge, *l. c.*, p. 92 ff. has reprinted a later edition of Haerlem, 1613. Our quotations are from Dr. Moormann's reprint.

Flemish version only (not in the Rhenish or Low German ones) printed in a Spanish dependency and early enough, probably, to have been utilized by the author of the *Lazarillo* in the lost first edition (not long before 1554) there appeared the following *exempel*, containing in substance the episode of the *buldero*, a good deal shorter than Masuccio's tale, yet with certain details which would seem to make it a more likely source for the *Lazarillo*

Het waren twee ghesellen die in Westvalen ende omtrent Colen regneerden, daer af die eene ghecleet was gelijck een priester, ende die ander ghelijck een ander fijn man Desen eenen die ghelijck een clerc was hadde een groot heylichdom, gelijc hy seyde, ende hier af hadde hy valsche brieven Ende daer hy in de steden oft dorpen quam, daer gaf hi den prochiaen dat derde deel, dat hy zijn heylichdom op den stoel mochte toonen ende daer af prediken Ende als hy op den stoel stont, ende seer groote leughenen looch, soo stont zijn gheselle onder dat volck ghelijck een vreemt man, ende sprac seer luyde tot den volcke, dat bedroch was, ende dat dien clerc met zijn heylichdomme een boeve was, ende dattet al ghelogenous was dat hy seyde Ende na dat hy dat gheseyt hadde viel hi achterwaets op die aerde, al oft hy besiet hadde geweest, ende hi hadde roode aerde, ende zeepe in zijn mont ende in zijn ooren, ende doen scheent dat hy schuynde en bloedde uut den mont ende uut die ooren Ende daer nae riep die clerck tot den volcke Hoe grooten ende schoone mirakel nu hier ghedaen heeft dit heylichdom Laet ons toch nu hertelijc bidden dat God door dit heylichdom desen armen mensche wedeom ghesont wil maecken, ende terstont daer na bequam hy weder Ende aldus gaven die slechte menschen tot den heylichdom alle dat sy vermochten (Moormann, p 32 )

Translated into English this would read

In Westphalia and about Cologne two companions carried on, one dressed like a priest, the other appearing like some other man of substance The one who looked like a cleric possessed, so he said, a very holy relic, and with reference to this he carried forged letters And when he came into a town or village, he would give the parish-priest one third for the privilege of showing his relic from the pulpit and preaching about it And as he stood in the pulpit and told very great lies, his confederate would stand among the people as if he were a stranger, and would say to the people in a very loud voice that the cleric with the holy relic was a rascal, and that all he said was a pack of lies And after he had said that, he would fall backwards on the ground, as if he had been struck with sickness, and he had red earth and soap in his mouth and in his ears, and then it seemed as if he were foaming and bleeding from mouth and ears And thereupon the cleric would shout to the people How great and wonderful a miracle this relic has now wrought Let us pray now with all our hearts that God, through the power of this relic, may make this poor man sound again, and presently he would come to his senses And so the simple people would give to the holy relic everything they could afford

The fifth chapter, like other parts of the *Lazarillo*, has evidently been tampered with and shortened for instance, the confederate who first appeared in the village in company with the *echacuervo* (p 233), is referred to, when first mentioned (p 230, l 2), as *el alguazil*, but even in its present shape the chapter presents certain details which place it nearer to the *Liber vagatorum* than to Masuccio's *novella*. Thus both the Flemish version and the *Lazarillo* introduce the impostor as propitiating the local parish priest (*Lazarillo*, p. 228), and both represent the confederate as foaming at the mouth, with the Flemish version even providing the technical explanation of the lifelike display.

It would be impossible, of course, to draw any definite conclusions from such meagre evidence. But this much, at any rate, might be suggested that the episode of the *buldero* formed a standard part of an age-old repertory of sure-fire tricks and dodges used by the knights of the road to exploit the credulity of the masses. The *Liber vagatorum* attempted to expose these in a business-like manner, while both Masuccio and the author of the *Lazarillo*, elaborating one particular episode with no little artistry, made use of it, incidentally, in their anti-clerical propaganda. A connection between Spain and the Aragonese court at Naples, where the *Novellino* originated, is by no means excluded, but a more direct road, and an even more frequented one, lay open between Spain and the Spanish Low Countries, making even more likely a connection between a Flemish book that was being approved in Brussels and printed possibly in Antwerp about 1547 and the original *Vida de Lazarillo de Tormes*, which itself, for all we know, may have been printed in the Low Countries, perhaps in Antwerp, possibly in 1553. It is not perhaps time to take more seriously that puzzling entry in Brunet's *Manuel* <sup>5</sup> "Cependant nos notes nous fournissent l'indication d'une édition d'Anvers, 1553, in-16, que toutefois nous n'avons pas vue"? Few scholars will repeat with Morel-Fatio "Qu'on nous montre l'édition de 1553 et nous y croirons," <sup>6</sup> and most will admit with Foulché-Delbosc the existence of a common ancestor to the three editions of 1554. The editions of Antwerp and Burgos, close to each other and free from the apocryphal additions of Alcalá, may well be our closest ap-

<sup>5</sup> Fifth edition

<sup>6</sup> *Études sur l'Espagne*, Paris, I (1888), p. 119



proach to an Antwerp princeps. With such a princeps the Burgos variants might be expected to outnumber those of Antwerp, which is precisely what we find in Foulché-Delbosc's edition of a conjectural princeps. Moreover, was it just a coincidence that the first continuation of the *Lazarillo*, smoothly joining on to the first part, should appear so rapidly, in 1555, in two distinct editions, precisely in Antwerp? On the other hand, internal evidence makes Sebastián de Horozco a likely candidate for the authorship of the *Lazarillo*.<sup>7</sup> Should we begin to think of the possible Flemish connections of Horozco, perhaps through the Egas family?<sup>8</sup> Are we perhaps, by looking to the Netherlands, drawing nearer to the solution of a long-standing problem of bibliography and authorship?

Bryn Mawr College

JOSEPH E. GILLET

#### OFr CHAUFREIN AND OFr-MFr CHANFREIN

A meaning 'head-armor of battle-steed' for the word *chanfrein* can hardly have arisen before the latter part of the thirteenth century when, according to Gay's *Glossaire archéologique*, such head armor first appears. It is true that *chanfrein* is not uncommon in the twelfth century, but the meaning in most cases must be, and in all cases so far noted for the early period can be, 'horse's bit' (or, at broadest, 'horse's bridle').<sup>1</sup>

By the side of *chanfrein* ('bit') there frequently occurs a spelling *chaufrein*. The Tobler-Lommatsch dictionary, in every instance where this spelling occurs in the examples it cites, emends *chaufrein* to *chanfrein*, apparently on the assumption that editors of

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Cejador's edition, pp. 35 ff., Bonilla's edition, Madrid, 1915, p. xviii ff.

<sup>8</sup> For the connection of that great family of architects with Horozco's wife of Fr. G. Rubio and I. Acemel, in *Boletín de la Soc. esp. de excursiones*, xx (1912) 225 ff.

<sup>1</sup> For the meaning, see Fr. Bangert, *Die Tiere im afrz. Epos*, Marburg, 1885, p. 62, Fr. Schmidt, *Das Reiten und Fahren in der afrz. Lit.*, Göttingen, 1914, pp. 27-29. The 1925 Jena dissertation of K. Greve, *Sattel- und Zaumzeug in der afrz. Lit.* (listed in TobLom s. v. *chanfrein*) is reported to be still unpublished. For discussion of the etymology, see Gamillscheg, *ZRP* 40, p. 157, Regula, *ZRP* 43, p. 6, Bruch, *ZRP* 55, p. 459, Wartburg, *FEW*, II, 347, n. 15.

the printed texts (or scribes whose manuscripts editors have used) have misread an *n* as *u*. Of the nineteen examples which the TobLom cites, eight have *chan-*, five have *chan-* in the text but with a variant reading *chau-* (three) or *chanx-* (two), six have *chau-*, to which there might have been added (in addition to *Og Dan* 2463) a second example in *Og Dan* (4631).<sup>2</sup> In other words the TobLom emends in approximately half the examples cited, and this of itself should have given pause. Confusion of *n* and *u* is, to be sure, easy, and moreover the two letters can be indistinguishable in the handwriting of numerous scribes, however, in instances where editors are uncertain whether the manuscript reading is *chanfrein* or *chaufrein*, the influence of the modern spelling (and also the influence of our historical dictionaries) would lead them to give preference to *chanfrein*,<sup>3</sup> so that a reexamination of manuscripts used for edited texts might diminish the number of cases of an assured spelling *chanfrein*.

The word is present in the *Roman d'Alexandre* (Branch II, 1672), for which photostats of all manuscripts are accessible at Princeton University. Of the eighteen manuscripts which contain the passage, thirteen (CCb<sup>1</sup>sDGHJKMQRSTY) distinctly have *chau-* (or *cau-*), one (B) has *chal-*, one (F) has *chaut-*, in three (INP) it is uncertain whether the letter is *u* or *n*. In this passage therefore fifteen out of eighteen scribes cast their weight for *chaufrein* and the other three give no evidence to the contrary.

There is also sound evidence that *chaufrein* lived on in French and in English for as long as the term remained in common use: the texts of the *Perlesvaus* printed at Paris in 1516 and 1523 have *chaufraim*,<sup>4</sup> Palsgrave's *Eclaircissement* (1530, p. 204) gives only *chaufraim*, Cotgrave's *French-English Dictionary* (1650) recognizes the existence of *chaufrein* (s. v. *chaufraim* as an alternative form for *chanfraim*), and the only English forms for the older period, according to the *NED.*, are *shawfron* (1465), *chaufrayne* (1530), *chaufraim* (1688).

<sup>2</sup> Thanks are due Mr. Antonio Pace of Syracuse University for locating the variant readings present in the editions cited by the TobLom.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., for example, A. Henry's suggested emendation of *chaufrein* to *chanfrein*, *Rom* 65 (1939), p. 111.

<sup>4</sup> Passage corresponding to *chanfraim*, line 8170 of the Nitze Jenkins edition (in the passage corresponding to *chanfraim*, 598, the incunabula have *fram*). This information was kindly supplied by Professor Nitze.

Thus there is unquestionable testimony for the validity of a form *chaufrein*, and the evidence above cited even indicates that during a long period it was more widely used than was *chanfrein*, whether it arose as an alteration of *chanfrein* by popular etymology (cf. the *chautfram* of RALix, ms *F*) remains still to be determined. It has seemed desirable to call attention to the facts in the case in order that scholars who encounter the word in French manuscripts may note carefully whether the initial syllable contains an *n* or a *u*.

Princeton University

EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG

## CASE-FORMS IN -I IN THE OLDEST ENGLISH TEXTS

### (1) *rodi* (Ruthwell Cross)

Sievers wrote <sup>1</sup> "bisweilen steht im dat. instr. [der *ā*-stamme] -i, wie *īōdi*, *cæstri*, welches wol aus der *o*-declination entlehnt ist," and he has been generally followed, as by the most recent editors <sup>2</sup> of the Ruthwell inscription and in the most recent of non-elementary OE grammars <sup>3</sup>. But no explanation is added of the fact that while in the two instances cited the "dat. instr." form is found after local prepositions, the ending -i is in the *o*-stems confined to the functions of instr. proper and temporal locative, <sup>4</sup> if we seek parallels to feminine *on rodi*, *in Romæcæstri*, what we find is neuter *an landae* (Erfurt) and *in gluuuæ* (Epinal). The glosses are consistent in the use of instr. -i, and one must assume that a more extended use of the masc.-neuter ending has been suspected for the language of our more northerly inscriptions, but a less extended use is suggested by our only piece of evidence, the notorious *mip blodæ* on the Ruthwell Cross, <sup>5</sup> nor is the suspicion confirmed by the

<sup>1</sup> *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, § 252 Anm. 1

<sup>2</sup> Bruce Dickins and A. S. C. Ross, *The Dream of the Rood*, 11

<sup>3</sup> R. Girvan, *Angelsächsisch Handboek*, § 271

<sup>4</sup> The use of instr. and locative in temporal phrases of the type *thys gen* (Epinal) has points of resemblance with the distinction of imperfect and aorist aspects, there is no doubt that the type was felt as instrumental in OE.

<sup>5</sup> Economy of explanation forbids consideration of a relation with Gothic dative -a (<instr. *ē*), though this Germanic ending would have been mentioned by A. S. C. Ross (*Modern Language Review* 28, 149) if to his list of forms from which the OE ending can not be derived he had added an account of those from which it can.

instrumental usages of later Northumbrian.<sup>6</sup> Yet if these objections counted for nothing, one would still ask what motive could be given for an analogy which runs counter to the general tendency<sup>7</sup> of early Germanic dialects to differentiate the corresponding cases of *o*- and *ā*-stems, these declensions have their closest point of contact not with each other, but with the masc -neuter and feminine *i*-stems respectively, and it is in the latter declension one must therefore seek, with Sweet,<sup>8</sup> the origin of the feminine locatives in -i

#### (11) The Masc -Neuter Instrumental

The above remarks are not needed to show that there is no evidence in OE for the assumed (and probable) locative<sup>9</sup> origin of the masc -neuter instrumental.<sup>10</sup> That the semantic change implied

<sup>6</sup> A number of instrumental forms after *in* and *on* are found by G. K. Anderson (*Pub Mod Lang Assoc*, L, 950 ff.) in tenth-century Northumbrian texts. They include (i) a number of instances with *þon* (and *hwon*), which I. Dal (in *Die germanischen Pronominalkasus mit n-Formen*) has shown not to be instrumental, (ii) an isolated *on dūn* which A. himself suspects, (iii) *on dæge* (Durham Ritual), but cf. Luick, *Hist Gram* 372 Anm. 2, and (iv) a few instances of adjectival -e, which is found as a normal dative sing. masc. and so proves nothing, especially as such a common inflected form is liable to occur syntactically in so corrupt a gloss as the *Lindisfarne*.

<sup>7</sup> The standard example for West Germanic is the Nom. Plur. of *o*-stems. The latter is probably equivalent to the archaic Vedic ending, whose formation is unclear (despite Meillet, *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique* 26 (3), 138, Fladbeck, *Anglia Beiblatt*, xli, 227, and Sverdrup, *Falk Festschrift* 306), but its retention will have been due to the characteristic distinction of the two declensions, otherwise destroyed in the Nom. by the Germanic coalescence of vowel-qualities, and the Gothic reformation of the Gen. Plur. is also less difficult if it be supposed to go back to a period where the Nom. still showed the distinction phonologically preserved only in the West Germanic dialects.

<sup>8</sup> *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1875-6, 547.

<sup>9</sup> If the usual designation "Loc-Instr." is taken to mean "Instr. of locative origin" it is harmless though absurd, where taken seriously, as by I. Dal in *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*, ix, 215, it is harmful. Whether a genuine old locative survives in *æt hām* is doubtful, we conceivably have an adverbial accusative (as in the isolated usage) with prepositional reformation, cf. also Benveniste, *Origines de la Formation des Noms en Indo-Européen*, p. 91.

<sup>10</sup> It is very doubtful if the continental instr. in -u has a counterpart in the *Lindisfarne* gospels. The scribe of this text was familiar with the varia-

was early is suggested by Gothic isolated *ei* (= *damit* < *darn*), if the usual derivation from a pronominal locative is valid

If the cases of the Germanic masc *i*-stems, apart from the nom - voc - acc, had endings distinct from the *o*-stems in the singular, this cannot be shown in OE. The forms *daeli* (instr.) and *faengae* (dative) are both those of the *o*-stems, or from the OE standpoint of the *jo*-stems, despite R. Girvan, *Angelsaksisch Handboek* § 279.

(111) *Uyrd* (Leiden Riddle 9)

For this genitive cf. *Indogermanische Forschungen* LIV, p. 266, where however I do not note certain difficulties in Flasdieck's theory of the analogical origin of the West Germanic genitive<sup>11</sup> of the *a*-stems. The influence of this class's case-grouping on that of the feminine *i*-stems may have been earlier than the instances of direct transference. In the second line of *Cædmon's Hymn* (Northumbrian version) beginners usually take *maecti* as an acc. singular, in which they have the support of Bede's "paraphrase,"<sup>12</sup> but not of the OE. grammars, which recognize no acc. sing. in *-i*. A disyllabic acc. sing. must nevertheless occasionally have occurred early in this class, as shown by the metrically assured *dæde* of *Beowulf* (line 889), and could be earlier than the coalescence of unaccented *-æ*

tion of *-e* and *o* in endings, that *-o* is never found in the third sing. weak pret. and in the type *hine* is explicable by the fact that *-e* was here recognisable as part of a polyphonemic formative, and was therefore less liable to a scribal variation on the analogy of endings in simple *-e* (Cf. Ross, *Accidence of the Lindisfarne Gospels*, 37 and 55).

<sup>11</sup> The gen. sing. never shows the assumed original ending in the Continental dialects, though the nom. - acc. plur., which would lie at the starting-point of the analogical process, does, and this is regular in the adjectives which nevertheless appear to show a reformed gen. sing., while the pronominal forms are difficult apart from this fact, as Slavonic also presupposes an original ending with nasal. In view of certain remarkable Slavonic-West-Germanic coincidences (cf. the present participle) it is possible we have to deal with something old.

That early West Saxon retains a distinction of Nom. and Acc. plur. in the feminines (Kern in *Paul-Braune Beiträge* 31, 272 ff.) is very improbable, the forms in *-e* may have been retained in the copies where an interpretation as acc. sing. was possible in the minor context, at any rate the explanation of the seemingly exclusively acc. plur. ending *-e* is probably to be sought rather in scribal tradition than in Germanic origins.

<sup>12</sup> A. H. Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 1.

and -i, in this case the introduction of oblique -i on the analogy of the case-identity in the *ā*-stems is at least as likely as direct transference

C E BAZELL

Magdalen College, Oxford

## NOTES ON THE OLD-ENGLISH CHARMS

The following notes on the Old-English Charms, cited according to Grendon's text,<sup>1</sup> serve to identify a few of the Christian elements hitherto noticed only in a general way.

### A 12

The Latin incantation or formula contains only one completely garbled expression *rullia pars*, which may be a corruption of *illorum pars*. This suggestion is based on a comparison of the formula with *Apoc* xxi, 6 *ego sum A et Ω initium et finis*, and *ibid*, 8 *pars illorum erit in stagno etc*. That both the formula and *Apoc* xxi, 8 are curses tends to confirm the emendation. The formula, properly punctuated, might well read *Ω pars, Ω illorum pars, et pars in[ī]opia est A et Ω, <initium et finis. Amen>*.

### A 13 (1)

"Swā sē witega cwcæð  
þæt sē hæfde āre on eorþrice, sē þe ælmyssan  
dælcde dōmlīce, drihtnes þances" (11 37-9)

"The prophet" (*sē witega*) is David and the reference is to *Psalm* cxī (Vulgate), *Beatus Vir*. The opening words of the Psalm, *beatus vir*, are echoed in *sē hæfde āre on eorþrice*. The second verse of the Psalm *potens in terra erit semen eius* epitomizes the spirit of the entire charm. The ninth verse *dispersit, dedit pauperibus* explains both the *sē þe ælmyssan dælcde*, and the reference

<sup>1</sup> Felix Grendon, "Anglo-Saxon Charms," *The Journal of American Folklore*, xxii (1909), 105-237. An anastatic reprint by G. Stechert, New York 1930, makes this edition generally available and should serve to stimulate interest in the Old-English Charms. For more recent bibliography see F. P. Magoun, Jr., "Zur den altenglischen Zaubersprüchen," *Archiv f. d. Studium d. neuer Spr.* cLxxii (1937), 18, note 2, also "Strophische Überreste in den altengl. Zaubersprüchen," *Englische Studien* lxxii (1937), 1-6.

to the almsman in the prose directions immediately following,<sup>2</sup> although the idea that the giving of alms is followed by blessings is common in the Scriptures.<sup>3</sup>

(11)

“And cweð þonne *SANCTUS, SANCTUS, SANCTUS*, of ende Sing þonne *BENEDICITE* æþenedon earmon, and *MAGNIFICAT* and *PATERNOSTER III*” (11 41-3)

The four liturgical prayers cited here are evidently not selected at random but with an eye to the purpose of the charm which is to assure good crops. The *Tersanctus*<sup>4</sup> is evidently to be sung because it includes the *pleni sunt caeli et “terra” gloria tua*, the *Benedicite*<sup>5</sup> because it calls upon *unversa germinantia in terra* to bless the Lord, the *Magnificat*<sup>6</sup> because of its *esurientes implevit bonis*, and the *Pater Noster* because of its petition *panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*. All these prayers praise God because He has rained plenty on the land and ask Him, as it were, to add to His praises by increasing the crops which glorify Him.

A 19

“*Credidi Propter*” *tribus vicibus* (1 2)

This rubric calls for the Psalm *Credidi propter quod locutus sum*, that is, Psalm cxv of the Vulgate, three times.

B 4

þū miht wip þām lāþan, ðe geond lond færð (1 6)

Cp I Peter v, 8 *adversarius vester diabolus tamquam leo rugiens circum, quaerens quem devoret*.

E 2

*Benedicite, omnia opera domini, dominum* (1 9)

For *dominum* read *domino*, according to the text of the *Benedicite* in the Vulgate and the Old Latin Bibles<sup>7</sup>

L. K. SHOOK

*Cambridge, Mass*

<sup>2</sup> Line 47 fol

<sup>3</sup> Cp *Ecclesiasticus*, xxxi, 8-11

<sup>4</sup> Also called the *Trisagium*, Gk τρις-άγιος. It is a liturgical adaptation of Is vi, 3 and Ps cxvii, 25-6, etc, and follows the Preface of the Mass

<sup>5</sup> *Daniel* iii, 57-86, 56. The Canticle of the Three Children (Not in the Hebrew, hence not in the King James version, but see *The Book of Common Prayer*, Morning Prayer, after the *Te Deum*)

<sup>6</sup> *Luke* i, 46-55

<sup>7</sup> J. M. Thomas, *Psalterium cum Cantico* (*Opera* i, ii, Rome 1741), 440.

## THE MYRGINGAS OF WIDSITH

In the Old-English poem *Widsith* a tribe called the Myrgingas is repeatedly mentioned, to this tribe, according to the poet, Widsith himself belonged. The identity of the tribe, and the etymology of the tribal name, have made trouble for the commentators. In my edition of the poem, pp. 176 ff., I have discussed the various theories, and see no need of repeating the discussion here. It will be enough to say that in all likelihood the Myrgingas lived in a district of Germany known to post-classical and medieval writers as Maurungani, Mauringa, Moringia etc.<sup>1</sup> The tribal name is obviously to be connected with the district name, but the precise connexion is not obvious. We have to do with a Germanic base *meus* / *maus* / *mus*, or, by Vernerian voicing, *meuz* / *mauz* / *muz*, and with the familiar Germanic suffix *ing* / *ung*. But what of the *g* which in the OE form appears between base and suffix? The Continental forms have nothing to correspond to this *g*, in these forms, the suffix is added directly to the *mauz* > *maur* variant of the base. In my previous discussion, I explained the *g* of the English form as a Germanic [j]. This explanation is possible, of course, only if one starts with the *muz* > *mur* variant of the base, since in prehistoric English the [j] was regularly lost after a long syllable. It would be better, though, to start with the *mauz* > *maur* grade of the base, in agreement with the Continental forms. Moreover, it seems unlikely that [j] would survive before the *-i-* of the suffix.<sup>2</sup> My theory, then, that OE *Myrgingas* goes back to a Germanic short stem noun *\*muzjō* 'bog, mire' plus the suffixal *-ingas* had better be given up.

The *e*-grade of our base is represented in Icelandic *mýrr* 'mire' from Germanic *\*meuzjō*. We have good reason, therefore, for thinking that the *a*-grade of the base might take *jō*-stem inflexion in the same way, and in fact the form *Mauringa* recorded by Paulus Diaconus is derivable from a Germanic long stem *\*mauzjō* 'bog, mire' plus the *-ing* suffix. I conceive that the *Myrg-* of OE

<sup>1</sup> The name-form Moringia occurs in the *Gesta Danorum* of Saxo Grammaticus (VIII, xiii, 2, ed. Olrik & Røder, p. 238). Saxo wrongly identified the district with the Swedish province of More, misled by a phonetic likeness.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. & M. E. Wright, *Old English Grammar* (3d ed., 1925), p. 146. But [j] might have been extended from the *ung* to the *ing* form of the name.



*Myrgingas* is a compound word in origin, going back to a pre-historic \**Mēari-gēan* > WS \**Miergīe* or \**Mýrgī* 'mire-district'. To this the *-ing* suffix was added, giving a name \**Mýrgī-ingas* > *Mýrgingas* 'inhabitants of the mire-district'. The formation thus differs somewhat from the *Mauringa* of Paulus, which means simply 'inhabitants of the mire' (like many regional names, *Mauringa* is a tribal name in origin). The word *gī* or *gē* 'district' answers to Gothic *gawi*, German *gau*. It is familiar as the second element of the shire-name *Sūðri-gē* 'Surrey' and appears in various other English place-names.<sup>3</sup> The first element \**Mēari-* of my hypothetical compound goes back to Germanic \**mauzjō* and thus answers to the *Maur-* of Paulus. The extant OE *Mýr-*, however, is equally well connected with Germanic \**meuzjō*, which would become \**mýr* in West Saxon.

KEMP MALONE

### CHAUCER'S SHIPMAN'S TALE AND SERCAMBI

The closest parallel to Chaucer's *Shipman's Tale*,<sup>1</sup> namely, tale no. 31 of Sercambi's *Novelle*,<sup>2</sup> was I think too hastily discarded by Mr. John Spargo<sup>3</sup> as Chaucer's possible source. First, Mr. Spargo rejects as source material Boccaccio's *Decameron*, VIII, 1<sup>4</sup> (and, by implication, Sercambi's redaction of this tale) because its plot is

<sup>3</sup> See P. H. Reaney, *The Place-Names of Essex* (1935), p. xxi.

<sup>1</sup> The edition used is that of F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Boston, etc. [1933] (pp. 188-93).

<sup>2</sup> The edition used is that of R. Renier, *Novelle inedite di Giovanni Sercambi*, Turin, 1889 (pp. 81-4). For opinions upon Chaucer's knowledge and use of Sercambi's *Novelle*, whose framework is the closest literary parallel to that of *The Canterbury Tales*, and also upon its relationship to Chaucer's Italian journeys, see section vi of R. A. Pratt and K. Young, *The Literary Framework of 'The Canterbury Tales'*, in the forthcoming *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales'*.

<sup>3</sup> J. W. Spargo, *Chaucer's Shipman's Tale, The Lover's Gift Regained* (*F. F. Communications*, no. 91), Helsinki, 1930 (pp. 11-7), where the tale is referred to as no. 19 (Renier's numbering).

<sup>4</sup> The edition used is that of A. F. Masséra, *Giovanni Boccaccio Il Decameron (Scrittori d'Italia)*, 2 vols., Bari, 1927 (II, 103-6). In general, it may be noted in passing, the problem of Chaucer's knowledge or use of the *Decameron* falls outside the scope of the present study.

more complicated than that of the *Shipman's Tale*. Mr. Spargo's rejection is based on his supposition (supported by a reference to Chaucer's "technique in rehandling Boccaccio's *Filostrato*"<sup>1</sup>) that the poet's "tendency in general" was to allow a plot to remain essentially the same as he found it.<sup>5</sup> But Chaucer did not always "accept plots as he finds them,"<sup>6</sup> as is demonstrated by his treatment of the *Teseida*, whose plot, events, and motivation he in general simplified.<sup>7</sup> There is no proof that in the *Shipman's Tale* Chaucer was retelling Sercambi's *novella*; but I hope to show that such a redaction lay within the scope of both the interest and the power of the writer of the *Knigh't's Tale*.

After rejecting *Decameron*, VIII, 1, Mr. Spargo points out that Sercambi, in his redaction of Boccaccio's tale, provided additional motivation for the plot, and then states that otherwise Sercambi's "story is identical with Boccaccio's."<sup>8</sup> But Sercambi's tale differs from Boccaccio's also in certain details which are paralleled in Chaucer's version. Chaucer and Sercambi, but not Boccaccio, agree in the italicized portions of the following parallel summaries of the three versions.

Sercambi tale no 31 of the <i>Novelle</i>	Chaucer the <i>Shipman's</i> <i>Tale</i>	Boccaccio <i>Decameron</i> , VIII, 1
A man would possess the loose wife of a wealthy merchant, he uses a go-between (who has brought men to her before), the wife will take him for 200 florins <i>on the following Sunday</i> , when her husband will be away. The lover will bring a servant with him.	A man loves the wife of a wealthy merchant whose friend he professes to be. She asks him for 100 francs which she needs <i>on the following Sunday</i> .	A man loves the wife of a wealthy merchant who is his friend. Through a messenger he offers to do anything for her love. She asks for secrecy and 200 florins. She will send for him when her husband goes away. The lover will bring a companion with him.
The lover borrows 200 florins from the husband, <i>who requests its prompt repayment</i> , the lover asks if he may return the money to the wife.	The lover borrows 100 francs from the husband, <i>who requests its prompt repayment</i> .	The lover borrows 200 florins from the husband.

<sup>5</sup> See Spargo, pp 11-3

<sup>6</sup> See Spargo, p 12

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, the comparison offered by R. K. Root, *The Poetry of Chaucer*, Boston, etc [1934], pp 163-6

<sup>8</sup> See Spargo, p 17

Sercambi tale no 31 of the <i>Novelle</i>	Chaucer the <i>Shipman's</i> <i>Tale</i>	Boccaccio <i>Decameron</i> , VIII, 1
<i>The next day</i> the husband goes away	<i>The next day</i> the husband goes away	After a few days the husband goes away
<i>The following Sunday</i> the lover gives the money to the wife in the presence of his servant <i>They spend the day and the night together</i>	<i>The following Sunday</i> the lover gives the money to the wife <i>They spend the following night together</i>	The wife sends for the lover, who gives her the money in the presence of his companion They spend many nights together
In the presence of the wife, the lover tells the husband that he could not use the money and so returned it to the wife	The lover tells the husband that he has returned the money to the wife	In the presence of the wife, the lover tells the husband that he could not use the money and so returned it to the wife
<i>The husband expresses surprise that his wife should not have told him of the return of the loan, she replies that she had not thought of the money as a returned loan</i>	<i>The husband expresses surprise that his wife should not have told him of the return of the loan, she replies that she had not thought of the money as a returned loan</i>	She admits this and tells her husband that she had not yet remembered to tell him
She then repays her husband	She can repay her husband only in the manner she paid the lover, for she has spent the money	She then repays her husband

To suppose that Sercambi's *novella* might have been the source of the *Shipman's Tale* is at the same time to imagine that Chaucer might have simplified the plot by omitting the following features.

- 1 The go-between to arrange the meeting of the wife and lover
- 2 The outspoken request for love
- 3 The lover's request to the merchant that the money be returned to the wife
- 4 The witness of the lover's giving the money to the wife
- 5 The wife's presence when the lover tells the merchant that he returned the money
- 6 The lover's remark to the merchant that he could not use the money

If Chaucer deliberately gave up the witnessing of the payment and repayment of the money (nos 4 and 5), he exercised skilful economy and tended to make the motivation human rather than

mechanical<sup>9</sup> If he made the meeting of the wife and her lover clandestine (nos 1 and 4), and simplified the steps leading up to the meeting (nos 1 and 2), Chaucer made their rendezvous somewhat casual, and intensified the characterizations of both the lover and the wife And finally, if Chaucer decided to allow the wife to spend the money on array and then offer to repay her husband abed, the poet thereby made the wife more real than ever before, and gave the tale—at first intended for the Wife of Bath<sup>10</sup>—one of its most original and feminine touches

ROBERT A PRATT

*Queens College*

## REVIEWS

*The Tragedy of Macbeth by William Shakespeare The Tragedy of Julius Caesar by William Shakespeare* Both edited by GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE Boston Ginn and Company, 1939 Pp xx + 253 \$ 85 each

We have been long waiting for the Kittredge Edition of Shakespeare, and at last the first two volumes are before us The one-volume Shakespeare text published by Professor Kittredge not long ago, which furnishes the textual basis for the new Edition, gave a foretaste of his quality in its introductions to each play Professor Kittredge's great contribution to Shakespearian scholarship is above all expository Hitherto it has been delivered in the main through the living word, from the mouth of the greatest Shakespeare teacher who has ever lived The word of Kittredge has gone forth from the benches of his Harvard lecture-room, spread by his disciples, who number among them most great American Shakespearians, throughout the length and breadth of his own country

A glimpse of his mind upon Shakespeare reached a wider audience when his masterly tercentenary *Lecture* was published in 1916 And some twenty years later London heard him in his

<sup>9</sup> This is also true of no. 3, regarding which Chaucer and Boccaccio are in agreement It should also be noted that only Chaucer and Boccaccio present the lover and merchant as friends

<sup>10</sup> See J S P Tatlock, *The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works* (Chaucer Society, Second Series, no 37), London, 1907, pp 205-6

memorable Northcliffe Lectures at University College. A legend then became history for England as for the United States. It is not often that one can write thus about a living scholar with the certainty of general approval.

Professor Kittredge's exposition of Shakespeare—always the instrument of a stern intellectual discipline—rests upon solid bases. A firm classical training, mastery of medieval literature, exceptional philological competence, a life-long study and love of the plays themselves and of Elizabethan life and literature, a shrewd, humane, sensitive, and sinewy mind obnoxious to all easy brilliance, all these are ingredients in the strong working brew of his thought. Not for nothing, moreover, do the records of Saffron Walden show how Kittredges were rooted deep in Essex soil in the sixteenth century. Wherever he goes, Shakespeare goes with him, enlivens the way, and points the tale. If Kittredge's Old Farmer has been reading Shakespeare, the Professor follows on his tracks a step behind. The ripe fruit of fifty such years has now begun to appear before us.

I have often wondered whether it was *Macbeth* that first led Professor Kittredge into the exhaustive study recorded in his *Witchcraft in Old and New England*. It is clear, at any rate, that he is especially qualified to speak upon one aspect of the play. In his admirable Introduction he will have no truck with such fancies of the *intelligentsia* as make play with projections and personifications, and indeed all his comments upon the supernatural here, as in *Julius Caesar*, are conclusive. But it is after all the Notes that record for us his expository teaching. Concerning them, it may suffice to say that I for my part propose henceforth to amend my stock piece of advice for students in doubt—to see what Dr Johnson says. For 'Johnson,' read 'Johnson and Kittredge.' Whether it be a question of interpretation, or of illuminating comment and analogy, his observations are those of a master. Consider, for instance, the notes on *Macbeth* III 4. 37, or on *Julius Caesar* II 1. 66-69, or a score of others.

Professor Kittredge, in his general outlook, is equally concerned with the play as a piece of literature, as a shape in Shakespeare's own vision, and as a stage-play. There is a due balance of interest, and of judgment. In this connection, I feel that Professor Kittredge has not, in his Introduction to *Julius Caesar*, given due weight to the remarkable significance of the 'Roman thought' that struck Shakespeare and to the emergence of tragedy. But with talk abroad about the poet's spiritual Rake's Progress, one may well be chary of touching upon his artistic and intellectual development.

Professor Kittredge avoids dogmatism, and prefers to state a full case with his judgment, 'taking' the reader 'with him,' to use an Elizabethan idiom. I cite an instance to the contrary with trepidation, for it is an old bone of contention. But he does in

fact content himself with declaring without more ado that in the Folio reading 'making the Greene one, Red,' the comma is a misprint. Shades of differences in meaning between words in Elizabethan and modern usage respectively are carefully attended to, a notable and necessary feature of his commentary. I wonder if his very familiarity with Elizabethan English allowed him to pass over the word 'wink' in *Macbeth* without such comment. But his Glossarial Index is complete and helpful, in both volumes. The type here is however too small for comfort. Elsewhere the books are legibly and clearly printed. I have noted only one misprint, in *Macbeth*, p. xviii, note 3, 'Norms' for 'Norns'. Textual Notes are appended, giving a summary of variants and of conjectures.

The progress of English scholarship must now for a time be entrusted solely to other than English scholars. It is good to know that the lamp will be held in such hands. Here is work built to outlast all forces that silence truth, freedom, and honest purpose, and distort even Shakespeare to evil ends.

C. J. SISSON

*University of London*

*Thomas Fuller's The Holy State and the Profane State* Edited by MAXIMILIAN GRAFF WALTEN. New York: Columbia University Press, 1938. Vol. I, Introduction, Notes, and Appendix, pp. xvi + 282 + 56, Vol. II, A reduced facsimile of the First Edition, pp. xx + 441. \$7 00.

*The Formation of Thomas Fuller's "Holy and Profane States."* By WALTER E HOUGHTON, JR. Cambridge. Harvard University Press, 1938. Pp. viii + 260. \$3.00.

Mr. Walten differs from Mr. Houghton as a cartographer, tracing the streams that combine to form a lake, differs from a limnologist who studies its hidden springs and the life in its waters. In terms of four main literary traditions—"character-writing, essay, biography, and courtesy book" (p. 7)—Walten presents Fuller as "a great constructive artist" (p. viii), while Houghton stresses "at least a dozen literary traditions—casuistry, and secular moral philosophy, courtesy and treatises of policy . . . books of estates and domestic conduct . . . biographical dictionaries and historical chronicles . . . rhetoric and medical works on the mind (pp. 247-8)," and even books on witchcraft. Both men are pioneers among the influences that formed the *States*, but Houghton goes much further afield than Walten. To the latter everything in the first book of *The Holy State* seems to belong to the subspecies of

courtesy literature known as the book of parental advice (p 42), while to Houghton that influence seems less important than that of "Christian economy" (p 99), and he regards the entire work as the outgrowth of two primary traditions—the organic theory of society with its exposition in the literature of estates, and the "treatises of policy" for the careers of gentlemen" (p 43). In this light the "essays" sandwiched in Fuller's third book between the middle class "characters" of Book II and the aristocratic "characters" of Book IV are organically explained and derived mainly from the literature of casuistry. Walten feels the heterogeneity of the *States*. He cites Fuller's "almost indiscriminating use of anything that occurred to him—material from jest-books, fabliaux, commonplace books, chronicles, histories theological works" (p. 10). On one page (11) Walten thinks that Fuller "probably derived his idea for *The Holy State and the Profane State* from Heywood (*Gunarkeon*), as well as from Valerius Maximus and Breton (*The Good and the Badde*)" On another (45) he argues that to none of the writers on courtesy was Fuller so "much indebted as to Richard Brathwaite," of his acquaintance with whom Houghton (p 116, n) "can find no conclusive proof" On still another (33) Walten stresses the influence of the character-writers, holding that "Fuller's work is more akin to Earle's than to that of any other writer of character," while Houghton (p 32) simply believes it "more than probable" that "the seventeenth century character was one of the sleeping images of things which Fuller's fancy moved to the light," and thinks that of all the writers who fused the character with the essay the least likely to have influenced him was Earle.

In design and as an interpretive theory, Houghton's essay is more impressive than Walten's introduction. The latter should be judged by the light shed by his notes on the problems in literary relations that he chooses to treat. When Houghton all but ignores one of them, as he does the influence of the classics upon Fuller and especially of Suetonius upon the *Life of Andronicus*, Walten scores, but when they both analyze a major factor like Bacon's influence upon Fuller's imagination, Houghton is the stronger. If he handles detail less exhaustively than Walten's notes do, he handles it with better mastery and meaning. Walten's commentary, though it is invaluable rich, overlooks some crucial opportunities to illuminate Bacon's connections with the *States*. For example, when in "The Good Physician," because vulgar opinion has always confused mountebanks with physicians, Fuller praises the poets for feigning that Aesculapius and Circe were brother and sister and children of the sun, Walten does not clear up the puzzle with the information that in Greek mythology these personages were "the god of medicine and his sister, the sorceress." He should cite Bacon's reference to Aesculapius in *De Augmentis Scientiarum*,

IV, 11, where anent the same popular blunder, in Latin which Fuller translated almost literally, this

Quare Poetae oculari plane & peispicaces fuisse videntur, cum Aesculapii Circem Sororem dederunt, utrumque e Sole prognatum Omnibus enim Temporibus, fama & opiniones vulgi, Sagae, & Aniculae, & Impostores, Medicorum quodammodo rivales fuere

A more serious though less striking omission is Walten's silence about Fuller's reference in "The Good Parishioner" to "the jaundice in the eyes of the soul presenting colours false unto it." Here of course one of Bacon's favorite ideas in the *De Augmentis*, VI, III, and elsewhere is involved—"the colours of good and evil."

By and large Walten's commentary puts every reader of Fuller under great obligation. Many of his headnotes contain admirable short bibliographies of the primary and secondary sources of information about Fuller's chapters, and he often corrects the author's own notes on his authorities. No scholar could consistently maintain the standards that Walten sets for himself and we should not object to derelictions. Yet it is odd, when Fuller pairs the famous Spanish ambassador, Mendoza, with the bishop of Ross as examples of ambassadorial abuse of diplomatic immunity, to find the Spaniard identified and the Scotchman ignored. Camden's account of him, to which Fuller refers, goes at length into the bishop's insolence in court to William Aubrey and four other famous lawyers, and furnishes a capital illustration of Walten's excellent point, made elsewhere, that Fuller was attracted to Camden and to the historians generally because they were gossips.

Obviously, by its own standards, sins of omission might be charged without limit against a commentary on Walten's scale; but the only serious defect that I have noted is that allusions to "science" are sometimes slighted. Common sense, as the term is used in "Of Phancie," can hardly be dismissed as "the physical sense or senses." "That inward and Common Receptacle, called the *Sensorium commune*," as Stanhope explains,<sup>1</sup> is an "Internal Sense", and, like Fancy, though it borders upon Sensation, it is a province of Imagination. Again, in "The Good Sea-Captain," when Fuller asks, "Why doth not the water recover his right over the earth, being higher in nature?" some reply is needed—such, perhaps, as the editor might have found in John Swan's *Speculum Mundi*, where, in "The Third dayes work," the problem, is formally posed and solved.

On Fuller's wit, his mind and imagination, Walten has several notes (especially in connection with the blindness in the *States* to what is most spiritual in St Augustine) which reveal Fuller's limitations, yet Walten stoutly holds that he had "a splendid imagina-

<sup>1</sup> *Of Wisdom* by the Sieur de Charron Made English by George Stanhope, D D (third edition, 1729), I, 133-4



tion" (p 78) Influenced by R H Tawney and T S Eliot, Houghton treats Fuller's wit as "essentially ornamental and inorganic" (p 239) He admits Fuller's failure to "fuse idea and image," and acknowledges that the "spirit behind his constant play of wit seems a trifle facetious in the wrong way and so reinforces the impression of spiritual emptiness" (p 244) After the final analysis of "Emphasis and Fuller's Audience" and "Tone and Fuller's Sensibility," that conclusion is inevitable, but the critical job is so well done that, though his reputation may suffer, Fuller's interest and importance for readers of the twentieth century will be enhanced<sup>2</sup>

MERRITT Y HUGHES

University of Wisconsin

---

*Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: a Study in Editorial Method* By RONALD B McKERROW Oxford Clarendon Press, New York Oxford University Press, 1939 Pp xiv + 114 \$2 25

The Oxford Shakespeare is designed as an "old-spelling edition" with certain editorial changes and normalizations it is "an attempt to present the Shakespearian text as nearly as possible . . in the form in which its author or those persons who revised his manuscripts left it" The *Prolegomena*, which makes very stiff reading, is an elaborate preface dealing with the plan and the methods of this particular edition In the absence of the text of the plays the details of the preface are not always easy to keep in mind From it (and probably from the proposed edition as well) "the general" will fly in horror, but academic readers will find it full of interesting and instructive material

The discussion of "substantive," "derived," and "copy" texts, a model of concise exposition, is of value to students of all the Elizabethan authors The "substantive" text, Dr McKerrow tells us, is to be reproduced "as exactly as possible, letter for letter, and point for point," except where it appears "to be certainly corrupt" But corruption is a different thing from inconsistencies and from irregularities of spelling and grammar.

The third part discusses in great detail the editor's method of choosing and noting variant readings He discriminates between true variants and modernizations. For instance, *mushroom* is only

<sup>2</sup> In Walten's first volume I have noticed these misprints p 79, *religrosor* for *religrosor*, p 120, *Galenicus* for *Galenicus*, p 129, *Haskin* for *Haskins*, p 195, *Celus* for *Celus*; p 221, *Tuquibus* for *Tu quibus*, p 231, *παρὸν* for *παρὸν*, p 255, *fun* for *sun*

a modernization of *mushrump*, and hence is ignored in his collations, so, likewise, are such miscalled variants as *percullis porticullis*, *murther murder*, *then than*, *desperate desp'rate*, *where whether* *where*, *Ouergne Auvergne*. "The readings of other texts are not given [in the Oxford Shakespeare] for their own sakes, but merely as supporting, or failing to support, the reading of my text." These ideas are sound, though not necessarily applicable to all editions. The intention and method of the Furnesses were quite different. Their Textual Notes were designed to record the history of editorial opinion or practise, to tell the reader, for example, who first changed *cote* to *quote* or *tottered* to *tattered*, or who replaced *will we* with *we will*, thereby corrupting Shakespeare's words for two hundred years. In a recent edition of Shakespeare the novelty of the text depends largely on its return to Elizabethan readings, and most users of Textual Notes will find it helpful to see at a glance that this edition is the only one since the seventeenth century to restore an original reading, an old spelling, or a "faultry" grammar that all, or almost all, other editors have modernized or "corrected." Both methods have their place. Certainly an editor has a right to formulate his own rules for his own edition, even if they happen to be bad. Dr McKerrow's rules are good, but he takes pain to say (p. 67) "it is no part of my purpose to record the history of editorial opinion or practice . . . which would be a very different thing."

For listing variant readings he has adopted certain useful symbols and other mechanical devices, some of which no doubt will be widely imitated. But they are not always easy to keep in mind, and a few appear to be needlessly complicated. Thus square brackets (pp. 85 f.) have several different significations, and it would have been simpler, clearer, and less offensive to the eye to state the variant "14 [and] thy] thine F<sub>1</sub>—Johns" as "14 and thy] and thine F<sub>1</sub>—Johns" or "14 thy<sup>2</sup>] thine." Perhaps, too, "F<sub>1</sub> (full line), 2" would be more immediately comprehensible if it ended "F<sub>2</sub>."

The Oxford University Press announces that "substantial progress has been made" with various plays of the Oxford Shakespeare, and that "printing has begun." Certainly the two specimen pages given in this book increase one's desire to see the completed work. Whatever the fate of the Oxford Shakespeare in these grim days, Dr McKerrow in his *Prolegomena* has written a treatise that, like his *Introduction to Bibliography*, is a boon to students of Elizabethan literature.

HYDER E. ROLLINS

Harvard University

*Kulturkritik und Literaturbetrachtung in Amerika* Von VIKTOR LANGE and HERMANN BOESCHENSTEIN (Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker B Germanistische Reihe Unter Leitung von Paul Merker und Friedrich Ranke Band XXIX ) Breslau Verlag Pfabatschs Buchhandlung, 1938 Pp 1v + 76 3 M

*Primitivism and Decadence, a Study of American Experimental Poetry* By YVOR WINTERS New York Arrow Editions, 1937 Pp xiv + 146 \$2 50

The first of these two books consists of two essays of about equal length on American criticism intended for a German audience. The general title is taken from the first essay by Dr Lange, who offers a summary of the development of American criticism from its beginnings in Knapp's "Lectures on American Literature" in 1829 down to the various critical personalities and schools of the 1930's. The author, like others before him, recognizes that criticism is at present the most important exercise of the American literary mind and he follows in his sketch the rise of a distinctly American school of thought independent of European, including English, influence in its aim and methods and reflecting, essentially, American cultural life in its changing aspects. Emerson, Whitman, Henry James, Brownell and Woodberry are the forerunners of the generations that came to expression after 1900 and which are the main theme of Lange's interest. From the impressionism of Gates and Spingarn he takes us to the protesting Humanism of Babbitt and More—More is treated with special copiousness—whose rationality finds its complement in the religious thought of T. S. Eliot and the emotionalism and historical perspective of Allen Tate. From this, the most important critical group of our day in America, the way leads to the opposite camp of Mencken and his followers, the expansive Americanism formulated in the work of Randolph Bourne, Van Wyck Brooks, and others, with its insistence on the necessity of the artistic representation of American life as it is without regard for moralistic traditions. But with proper regard for the social function of art—which brings us to Calverton, whose ideas have borne fruit in the Leftist movements of our time, largely nourished, however, by the experience of the post-war German expressionists. A short chapter on the rather arid discussion in university circles of the respective value of scientific research and appreciative criticism—Greenlaw and R. S. Crane are mentioned—closes this very good and helpful survey. (Erratum, page 8 in 1850 Poe was dead and could not have "prazisiert" anything.)

Dr Boeschstein's article on Irving Babbitt, the second in the book, fills, in a sense, an omission in Lange's sketch. It gives a good exposition of the main tenets of Humanism with special emphasis on Babbitt's criticism of German thought and literature. Nietzsche, Goethe, Kant, Schopenhauer, the Sturm und Drang, the Romantics, Schiller—they are all presented in the mirror of Babbitt's theory and the mere presentation is an implicit criticism of the theory,—practically the only criticism the author makes. From his German point of view he naturally cannot subscribe to Mercier's pride in the essentially French character of Babbitt's Humanism and misses a strong, positive force in his teachings. However, though he cannot accept many of the details, the general tendency seems to have his deep sympathy.

Dr Winters' book is a collection of essays revised and enlarged after earlier publication. He is a Humanist and a poet himself and his point of view is that of a practical craftsman. He appears as a poetical garage-man in overalls with a wrench in his hand, discussing the literary tin-Lazzies of the last twenty to thirty years, picking out their good parts and throwing the rest on the junk heap. That the junk heap is bigger than the collection of good parts is all in the line of his job which is to bring clarity and order, firmness and substance into the modernist conception of literary art. For the mere historian of literature his essays are extremely suggestive and at times provocative. His valuation of some of this day's poets is startling, though usually confined to the purely technical plane, while his comments on some of the older poets—Hardy, Rochester and others—are acute. Dr Winters is a formalist in the deeper sense that he claims that the morality of a poem consists in its formal perfection. Supported by such an intense conviction of the importance of form, he examines modernist American poets—and incidentally older European poetry as well—from the point of view of structure and its technical qualities generally. The method of repetition, the logical method, narrative, qualitative progression, the alternation of method, the double mood—under such headings he discusses various poetical structural types, devoting most space to "pseudo-reference," the more or less intentional obscurity which makes so much of modernist poetry so hard to enjoy. The chapter on poetic convention attempts to circumscribe—since a definition seems not yet possible—a new conception called by the old name, something like the basic tone to which every poem is keyed and to which the rise and fall in both words and meter stand in structural relation. Less interesting is the following chapter, which gives its name to the whole collection, with a not very clear definition of primitivism and decadence as his crook, the author attempts to separate the sheep from the goats, hitting Verlaine, for his personal

qualities, a sharp crack en passant. The longest and most important section of the book deals with the influence of meter on poetic convention. It offers some general principles of meter, but essentially it is a metrical analysis of several examples of free-verse poetry, beginning with the author's own, showing up the limitations of free-verse as a medium of expression for a variety of moods and demonstrating the advantages of more regular verse forms. The heroic couplet is treated with special emphasis and the author comes to the conclusion that "the heroic couplet, all things considered, appears to be the most flexible of forms it can suggest, by discreet imitation, the effects of nearly any other technique conceivable, it can contain all of these effects, if need be, in a single poem."

Dr. Winters is always interesting, though not always convincing, and his accentuation of his own free-verse, though it may represent the way he wants it pronounced, will hardly be accepted by the normal reader. On the whole, however, his is perhaps the most helpful book I have seen on modern experimental poetry.

Basel, Switzerland

H LUDEKE

*Über die Wortgruppen weltanschaulichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Wulfila* By НЕЦИР УГОК. Druckerei Winter Heidelberg. 1938. 74 pp. \$ 77

The author of this dissertation, written under the guidance of Professor H. Guntert at Heidelberg, lays down a formidable reason for his effort. Wulfila lived in an age when the Church was in the thick of a multi-cornered fight among the Arians, the Orthodox and still others. Since the Bible is a dogmatic document on general principles, Wulfila had to exercise extreme care in making himself clear to his followers. Of works on Wulfila's syntax and speech rhythm there are many, but only a precious few, Groeper and Kauffmann among others, have made even a remote attempt at investigating Wulfila's vocabulary, and of these Groeper has confined himself to synonyms while Kauffmann has stressed individual points with no thought of reaching a final conclusion.

In the main this is all correct, however much one might be minded to enlarge on the studies of Wulfila's translation as an evidence of his admitted and proved lexicographic ability. But certainly this particular theme has never been integrated more fully, or carried to the end with more studied skill. It is virtually all here, so far as the evidence is concerned.

The study is divided into three main sections, "Mythologie," with six sub-heads, "Religion" with four, and "Kult" with seven. A total of 111 root or basic words is investigated, to these must be

added 106 words that are variants of the 111 basic ones, making 217 in all, or nearly one word in every 14 attested in extant Gothic. In view of the fundamental significance of these words as used in the Bible, a study of the diligence and conservatism of this one can only be of value.

The author's plan is simple. He has very little to do with Latin, contending that Wulfila went to it only in doubtful cases. He refers to the other Germanic dialects, especially AHD, AND, AN, and AE with relative frequency, and generally by way of strengthening his fixed thesis that Wulfila was a remarkably expert linguist. To explain a given word, he gives the Gothic quotation in full, though it may run to more than three lines, and follows it up with a full quotation from the Greek. In numerous cases the exact number of times a word is used is given.

Under "Weltbild" he gives six basic words: *farhhus* *manaseþs*, *\*alamans*, *midjungards*, *himins*, *airþa*. The discussion of these covers five and one-half pages, a typical proportion. The first two, he shows by quotation, translate *κόσμος*, the first referring to both the animate and the inanimate world, whereas the second refers only to the world of human beings. He shows how *\*alamans* refers only to humanity as a whole, how *midjungards* applies only to the inhabited earth, it occurs four times, and how *himins* and *airþa* have a variety of meanings which stood Wulfila in good stead with the "peinlicher Sorgfalt auf stilistische Schönheit, Vollkommenheit und Wohlklang seiner Sprache," leading him at times to indulge in a "Neuschöpfung," such as *ufarhimnakunds*, as it occurs once, in I Cor. xv, 48.

Under "Kultstätten" there is one of the best sections of the study. The author treats in detail *alhs*, which occurs 27 times and refers only to the temple in Jerusalem, *gudhus* which occurs once, *gards bido* and *razn bido*, *gaqumþs*, *gafurds*, *swnagoge*, *awkklesjo*, *garda gudis* and *galwuga staps*. In this connection, Uğok writes: "Die ausserordentliche Reichhaltigkeit der Ausdrücke zeugt wiederum von der Genauigkeit der Übersetzung."

Uğok states that Wulfila took over the two Semitic words *kaurban* and *kaurbaunan* because "er hat die Bedeutung der Wörter nicht verstanden." This may be. He states too, despite his persistent contention that Wulfila was happy in his use of foreign words, that *awkklesjo* is translated in AHD by "Christenheit, kirche, samanunga, ladunga, usw." In reality, variety is a better proof of stylistic excellence than monotony.

Uğok follows throughout, for etymologies, Uhlenbeck, Holthausen, and Feist. This lightened his labor. He takes issue only with such scholars as Helm and Wesche. He claims that Wulfila "übersetzt vorwiegend nach der nordlichen *κοινή*." Others, in addition to Lietzmann, have said the same. He states that Wulfila used such a large number of "einheimische Wörter" that he went

far toward the nationalization of the Gothic language. He praises Wulfila for his adeptness at coining Gothic words, and remarks that he used foreign words only where there was no Gothic equivalent.

This is not an epoch-making conclusion. But even so this young Turkish scholar deserves credit. The individual who works through this study will learn, relatively, more Gothic than the one who swears by some such text as Feist's *Einführung in das Gotische*, with the Gothic at the top, the translation in the middle, and the hermeneutics at the bottom.

ALLEN W. PORTERFIELD

West Virginia University

*Homenaje a la memoria del Dr. Rodolfo Lenz*, Anales de la Facultad de Filosofía y Educación, sección de filología, II/1 (Prensas de la Universidad de Chile, 1938) Pp. 169

Un volume d'hommage offert par des savants sud-américains bien connus (Amado Alonso, Antenor Nascentes, Rodolfo Oroz, E. F. Tiscornia, Pino Saavedra)—les Allemands sont représentés par W. Giese) au professeur Lenz de l'Université de Chili à l'occasion de son 75<sup>ème</sup> anniversaire, n'a plus trouvé le maître en vie et s'est changé en un *in memoriam*. Deux articles (C. Vicuña, A. Alonso) reconstituent le portrait humain du professeur décédé, qui, avec son esprit méthodique et observateur, a su régénérer l'enseignement de l'espagnol au Chili et à renouveler la grammaire scientifique de cette langue. Le côté désuet de son "La oración española y sus partes" (1920), c'est-à-dire les conceptions philosophiques de Wundt sur lesquelles cet ouvrage plein d'observations pertinentes est basé, sont moins relevés dans ces articles que le côté novateur, et les découvertes ou descriptions nouvelles de sons espagnols mis en relief davantage que les théories sur le phonétisme "aborigène" du Chili. En revanche l'humeur batailleuse et l'idéalisme sévère de ce spécialiste et positiviste tenace et patient—tous traits qu'on voit aussi dans la reproduction de la tête qui ouvre le volume—sont bien marqués ("Su mente no salía de la filología. Así su espíritu reposaba en una contemplación beatífica y casi santa de la polémica activa y encendida de sus lecciones orales"). Le docteur Lenz, avec Karl Pietsch, Hanssen et peut-être M. Saidi Ali de Rio de Janeiro, restera un de ces représentants mémorables de l'ancienne Allemagne qui, avec une foi en la science illimitée et une science nécessairement limitée, par leur idéalisme positiviste et leur précision de grammairiens, ont su, dans le sol de ces Amériques soit plus pratiques soit plus romanesques, fixer les premiers jalons de la linguistique romane, quittes à laisser à de plus jeunes (comme A. Alonso, R. Lida, Ureña, Rosenblat) le soin d'élargir les cadres grammaticaux un peu trop rigides et d'assouplir cette précision par laquelle

les maîtres allemands avaient su discipliner les esprits. N'oublions pas en effet que le philologue a autant besoin de la précision que de l'imagination et que celle-ci ne peut jouer que quand elle a été sous le joug de celle-là!

Parmi les nouvelles contributions scientifiques je salue particulièrement l'article d'A. Nascentes sur les altérations de *senhor(a)* au Brésil—on aurait aimé voir le port *seu tunante!* avec son *seu* "article déprétiatif" inclû dans cette liste et on aimerait savoir si ce *seu* déspectif existe à côté du *siá* = *senhora* de même nuance au Brésil—et celui de R. Oroz sur l'élément affectif dans l'espagnol chilien. L'auteur distingue trois traits de ce *volgare*, les interjections, les hyperboles et les euphémismes.

Quelques remarques on aurait aimé voir citer à propos des interjections obscènes les articles de Munthe, Wagner et les miens—P. 39 *Puchas Diego!* ne contiendra pas *digo* mais *diablo* (v. Wagner, *Zeitschr.* XLIX, 2 sur un *don Diaguito* pour *diablo* chez Quevedo, et probablement aussi *tomar las de Villadiego* 's'enfuir')—P. 44 je pense que *corría que se fué diacha* ne contient pas *de hacha*, mais *diacha* = esp. *diache*, mall. *dianxa* (diable), cf. le fi *courir comme le diable* ainsi que l'esp. *tomar las de Villadiego*—P. 44 *una fiesta esta que se arde* n'est pas à l'origine le renforcement d'un adjectif, mais = *esta ardiendo*, cf. *RFE*, XII, 72.

LEO SPITZER

*Paris dans la "Comédie humaine" de Balzac* By NORAH W. STEVENSON Paris Courville, 1938 Pp. 238

Three elements may be distinguished in Balzac's Paris: the physical aspect of the city, the psychological and sociological portrayal of its inhabitants, and the more intangible element of the personification of the capital as a vast entity, full of mystery and strange powers—a creation rising above realistic description of *milieu* and *mœurs* to fire our imagination and implant in our consciousness a fantastic conception of the city which Mr. Roger Caillois has likened to an ancient myth. This thesis for the Paris *doctorat d'université* is concerned almost exclusively with the second of these elements. Ingeniously, if sometimes arbitrarily, Miss Stevenson contrives to present her tableau of Parisian manners and her analysis of the well-springs of Parisian character under four chapter headings: "L'Argent," "L'Esprit," "Le Cœur," and "L'Enfer parisien." There are some lacunae—for example, the treatment of love in its varied manifestations overlooks the important—and extremely Balzacian—theme of love in older men (Baron Hulot, Crevel, etc.). And Balzac's Paris "theory," expressed in prefaces, in the Davin introductions, and in the *Avant-propos* to the *Comédie humaine*, should not have been neglected. In general, however, the tableau is conscientiously and acceptably drawn up.

But when Miss Stevenson attempts to go beyond the classification and presentation of material from Balzac's writings, the results are



less happy Whether through excess of caution or faulty understanding of the methods of literary history, she seems to think it sufficient merely to set down the opinions of the critics and then, without weighing the evidence herself and often without even showing a choice among judgments by critics of unequal authority, to leave the reader to his own devices Partly as a result of this defect, the thesis fails to answer the questions which we should expect a serious study of Balzac's Paris to clarify How much does the author of the *Comédie humaine* owe, in his portrayal of Paris, to literary tradition? What was the influence of the conventional attitude toward the capital? Does his depiction of Paris consist chiefly of a mass of accurate details—"petits faits significatifs"—conforming closely to the actual Paris of the period, or do the author's creative imagination, intuition, and powers of synthesis play the more important rôle? Why is it that the Paris of the *Comédie humaine* impressed itself so strongly upon readers that it seemed—and perhaps still seems—more "real" than the actual, material city of every-day experience?—For these and other questions which occur to the student of Balzac's works Miss Stevenson has no answer, nor does she present all the material necessary for the reader to find the answer himself

On the whole it must be concluded that this important subject—of which the interest is matched only by the complexity—has not yet received definitive treatment Miss Stevenson has assembled a considerable body of documentation from Balzac's writings and arranged it in an acceptable tableau of the psychological and sociological aspects of his Paris, but it cannot be said that she has interpreted this material in such a way as to contribute very much to our understanding of Balzac and his art

CARLOS LYNES, JR

Princeton University

---

*Hommes et Œuvres du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle* Par HENRI PEYRE Paris,  
Editions Corrêa, 1938 Pp 345 Francs 36

A collection of isolated lectures almost always strikes the reader, less indulgent than the auditor, as insufficient or arbitrary But when the lecturer, in addition to his charm on the platform, possesses as intimate a knowledge of the texts and as sure a taste as does Professor Peyre, he has nothing to fear from the cold eye of the reader To be sure, his volume would have gained in homogeneity if he had omitted the essays on Victor Hugo and on D H Lawrence, both *dépaysés* in the midst of these penetrating discussions of contemporary French literature Despite the limitations of the lecture form, the more general subjects are excellently treated the contrast between pre-war and post-war, the keen evaluation of the modern

theatre, the spirit of revolt in its various manifestations, and the fortunes of contemporary French letters abroad. On Claudel and on Alain-Fournier P. has written very sympathetic and comprehensive essays, perhaps his best, whereas in dealing with Proust and Gide he has unfortunately limited himself to but one aspect or one moment of the writer's work.

The quality of the critic's taste can be measured by the perspicacity with which he discerns the pre-war renaissance—in which, however, he might have included still other manifestations such as Larbaud's *Barnabooth* and the foundation of the Vieux-Colombier. Elsewhere P. gives Copeau's theatre a little more than its due, for it was Antoine who twenty years earlier revealed Tolstoi's *Power of Darkness*. Nor is he unfair to the post-war, despite its exaggerations, he does not fear to characterize the epoch as "belle" and to point out that its theatre, for instance, surpasses that of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth. His pages on the so-called obscurity of modern literature should be recommended to all philistines, as well as to all students of the subject. One might question, on the other hand, certain statements: that Mauriac and Duhamel are the only real novelists today (p. 73), that no novelist since Proust has reached a worldwide audience (p. 264, what of Gide, Romans, Martin du Gard?), that Gide's conversion to communism was ephemeral (p. 113, this is true only if communism is interpreted as the party), that the contemporary American theatre is superior to the French (p. 227), and finally that the work of Proust and Gide "est un effort incessant pour donner droit de cité dans la littérature à l'étude de l'anormalité homosexuelle" (p. 117). But such judgments represent the opinion of an excellent critic, who, in voicing them, aimed no doubt to arouse discussion.

Columbia University

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

---

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*Die Sage von Gawain und dem grünen Ritter*. Von OTTO LOHMANN. Königsberg and Berlin 1938. Pp. 97. In this monograph Dr. Lohmann reconsiders the problem of the derivation of *Gawain and the Green Knight* using essentially the same evidence as that studied by Professor Kittredge in his well known book and by me in an article published in *Modern Philology* XIII, but reaching a different solution. Briefly he concludes that an Englishman joined to a fairy mistress story of normal type the head-cutting game (which originally was associated with an other-world journey and which he derived from a narrative represented by the versions in the *Fled Brucrend*), and the sharing of winnings, derived from a source

similar to *Miles Gloriosus*, and that he changed the point of the story so that it became a test of the hero *The Green Knight* in the Percy Folio and *GGK* descended independently from this English original. The other poems in which the head-cutting game appears do not derive from this source but merely link the head-cutting to stories of varied types (though *Mule sans Frain* and *Caradoc* may also be derived from the source of *GGK*). Logically, this solution seems entirely reasonable, and it may approach the truth, it has the advantages that it does not require 'stretching' the evidence, and enables one to accept all the features of *GGK* which look like elements of a fairy mistress story on their face value. In arriving at this conclusion, Dr. Lohmann tries to consider all the facts squarely, he insists on exact rendering of the passages in the texts and shows no little power of analysis of motifs. It is refreshing to encounter his uncompromising declarations that here Hulbert is wrong and there Kittredge errs. Hulbert is accustomed to such direct contradiction, but he doubts that Professor Kittredge is<sup>1</sup>

University of Chicago

J R HULBERT

---

*Brut y Brenhinedd*, edited and translated by J J PARRY. Med Acad. of America, Publication No 27. Cambridge, Mass., 1937. Pp xviii, 243. Six plates. \$6. The editor's text of this Welsh version of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae* is based on MS Cotton Cleopatra B v, but readings from the Book of Basingwerk are given in footnotes. The editor has also supplied an English translation. In an appendix (pp 219-224) are given a few selections from the version recorded in MS Peniarth 21. A second appendix (pp 225 f.) gives a Latin text of the so-called *Prophetia Merlini Silvestris*. An index of proper names (pp 227-243) adds to the usefulness of this useful book.

K M

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

S A TANNENBAUM, BIBLIOGRAPHIES. May I correct a stupid error in the third paragraph of my review of Dr Tannenbaum's bibliographies (*MLN*, LIV, December, 1939, p 605)? Instead of "Robert Withington's note on *The Faithful Shepherdess*" I should have written "Robert Withington's note on *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*"

BALDWIN MAXWELL

---

<sup>1</sup> There are, of course, many problems of detail considered in the book, in particular, the author repeatedly urges that the minor awkwardnesses and inconsistencies in *GGK* (stressed by Else von Schaubert in *Englische Studien* 57) are due to the alterations made in the course of changing a fairy mistress tale to a story of a test, and he argues strongly that *GGK* does not derive from a French source.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

**Baldwin, Charles S**—Renaissance literary theory and practice, classicism in the rhetoric and poetic of Italy, France, and England, 1400-1600 Ed Donald L Clarke *New York Columbia U Press*, 1939 Pp xiv + 251 \$2 75

**Bennett, Mary Angela**—Elizabeth Stuart Phelps *Philadelphia U of Pa Press*, 1939 Pp viii + 172 [U of Pa diss]

**Blanc, Robert E**—James McHenry (1785-1845), playwright and novelist Diss *Philadelphia U of Pa Press*, 1939 Pp 136

**Clark, Mary Elizabeth**—Peter Porcupine in America the career of William Cobbett, 1792-1800 Diss *Philadelphia U of Pa Press*, 1939 Pp vi + 193

**Dapp, Kathryn G**—George Keate, Esq., eighteenth century English gentleman Diss *Philadelphia U of Pa Press*, 1939 Pp viii + 184

**Faust, Bertha**—Hawthorne's contemporaneous reputation, a study of literary opinion in America and England, 1828-1864 Diss *Philadelphia U of Pa Press*, 1939 Pp 163

**Garrick, David**—The journal of, describing his visit to France and Italy in 1763 Ed George W Stone, Jr *New York Modern Language Association*, 1939 Pp xvi + 73 [M L A Revolving Fund Series, X]

**Griffin, Constance M**—Henry Blake Fuller Diss *Philadelphia U of Pa Press*, 1939 Pp viii + 117

**Griffin, Martin I J**—Frank R Stockton Diss *Philadelphia U of Pa Press*, 1939 Pp x + 178

**Hotchner, Cecilia A**—Wessex and old English poetry, with special consideration of *The Runn* *New York* published by the author Pp vi + 146

**Kinne, Willard A**—Revivals and importations of French comedies in England, 1749-1800 *New York Columbia U Press*, 1939 Pp xvi + 310 \$3 00

**Leopold, Werner F**—Speech development of a bilingual child, vol 1—Vocabulary growth in the first two years *Evanston and Chicago Northwestern U Press*, 1939 Pp xiv + 188 \$2 25 [Northwestern U Studies in Humanities, 6]

**Mersand, Joseph**—Traditions in American literature, a study of Jewish characters and authors *New York Modern Chapbooks*, 1939 Pp xvi + 247 \$2 00

**Nethercot, Arthur H**—The road to Tryermaine, a study of the history, background, and purposes of Coleridge's "Christabel" *Chicago, Ill U of Chic Press*, 1939 Pp x + 230 \$3 00

**Shakespeare, William**—The passionate pilgrim Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library Introd by J Q Adams *New York and London Scribner's*, 1939 Pp lxxvi + 64 pp of plates \$4 00 [Folger Shakespeare Library Pubs]

**Warren, Austin**—Richard Crashaw, a study in baroque sensibility *University, Louisiana La State U Press*, 1939 Pp xvi + 260 \$3 00

**Whitehall, Harold**—Middle English *u* and related sounds, their development in early American English *Baltimore Linguistic Society of America*, 1939 Pp 79 [Sup to Language, 19]

**Whiting, George Wesley**—Milton's literary milieu *Chapel Hill, North Carolina U of N C Press*, 1939 Pp xvi + 401 \$3 50

## GERMAN

**Alpár, Gyula**—Streit der Alten und Modernen in der deutschen Literatur bis um 1750 [Specimina dissertationum Facultatis philosophicae Reg Hung Univ Elisabethinae Quinqueecclesiensis 152] *Pécs Kultura Konyv Muntézet Mayer*, 1939 146 pp

**Barthel, Marga**—Das "Gespräch" bei Wieland Untersuchungen über Wesen und Form seiner Dichtung Diss [Frankfurter Quellen und Forschungen zur german u roman Philologie H 26] *Frankfurt a M Diesterweg*, 1939 126 pp M 3 80

**Boehmer, Julius**—Braunwald Ein Beitrag zur Ortskunde und Ortsnamenskunde *Kassel* 1939 32 pp M 1

**Bogeng, G A E**—Der Struwwelpeter und sein Vater Geschichte eines Bilderbuchs *Potsdam Rutten & Loening*, 1939 122 pp M 1 80

**Brokmans, Anna Luise**—Untersuchungen zu den Haustiernamen des Rheinlands. Diss Bonn [Rheinisches Archiv 34] *Bonn Rohrscheid*, 1939 viii, 80 pp M 3 80

**Brunmayr, Hans**—Die Dichtung Karntens Diss *Wien* 1939 196 typewritten pages 4°

**Buttner, Ludwig**—Gedanken zu einer biologischen Literaturbetrachtung *München Hueber* [1939] 152 pp M 4 80

**Burte, Hermann**, Zum 60 Geburtstag des Dichters am 15 Februar 1939 [Aus Oberbadisches Volksblatt, 1939 *Lornach* 1939] 82 pp

**Busch, Paul**—Friedrich Schlegel und das Judentum Diss München *Bottrop & W Postberg*, 1939 96 pp

Carlsson, Ann — Die Fragmente des Novalis *Basel Helbing & Lichtenhahn*, 1939 xi, 223 pp

Clausz, Margarete — Hinwendung zum Mysterienspiel bei neueren deutschen Dichtern Diss *Leipzig Dresden Dittert*, 1938 112 pp

Cordes, Gerhard — Zur Sprache Eilhards von Oberg [Hansische Forschungen H 1] *Hamburg Hamburger Verlags-Anstalt Wachholtz*, 1939 xv, 103 pp M 5

Crossley, Ralph G — Die Kaiserchronik Ein literarhistorisches Problem der alt-deutschen Literaturgeschichte Diss *Freiburg München Oldenbourg*, 1939 123 pp

Deutsche Volkslieder Balladen Unter Mithilfe von hrsg von John Meier Zweiter Teil, Zweite Hälfte, Dritter Teil, Erste Hälfte *Berlin de Gruyter*, 1939 Pp 1-xi, 219-303, 1-140 4°

Dreher, Arno — Das Fragmentarische bei Kleist und Holderlin als rassenseelischer Ausdruck Diss *Münster Würzburg Tritsch*, 1938 66 pp

Eberle, Julius — Die Mundart um die Kupfer nach Lauten und Flexion Diss *Tübingen Stuttgart Fink*, 1938 vi, 56 pp 1 plate

Erdmann, Helmut — Studien zur Geschichte der Sprache des deutschen Bauwesens Diss *Danzig Bad Pyrmont Reinhardt*, 1939 66 pp

Ernst, Paul, und das Drama (Gedruckt für die Mitglieder der Paul-Ernst-Gesellschaft) [Jahrbuch der Paul-Ernst-Ges. *München* 1939] 223 pp M 250

Esche, Annelinde — Elise Rudiger geb von Hohenhausen Ein Bild ihres Lebens und Schaffens Diss *Münster Emsdetten v W Lechte*, 1939 72 pp

Ferrari, Leonilde — Paul Heyse und die literarischen Strömungen seiner Zeit Diss *Bonn Würzburg. Tritsch*, 1938 97 pp

Fischer, Erika — Soziologie Mahrens in der zweiten Hälfte des 19 Jahrhunderts als Hintergrund der Werke Marie von Ebner-Eschenbachs Diss *Leipzig E Wunderlich*, 1939 119 pp M 780

Fontane, Theodor — Theodor Fontane und die Familie von Wangenheim Aus dem Nachlass hrsg von Conrad Hofer (Privatdruck hergestellt auf Veranlassung von Gerhard Schulze) [*Eisenach Bibliophilen-vereinigung*, 1939] 103 pp 350 copies

—, zum Gedächtnis 20 Sept 1898 Bearbeitet von Hermann Fricke [Brandenburgische Jahrbücher 9] *Potsdam Hayn's Erben*, 1938 92 pp 4° M 125

Fricke, Hermann — Dichter der Mark Ein Überblick *Berlin Hayn's Erben*, 1939 82 pp M 120

Friedrich, Wilhelm — Die Flurnamen des Bezirks Romerstadt Mit 3 Karten [Sudeten deutsches Flurnamen-Buch H 3] *Reichenberg Kraus*, 1939 115 pp 4° M 360

Gehring, Friedrich Wilhelm — Die volks deutsche Dichtung in unserer Zeit [Die deutsche Leistung in der Welt Bd 4] *Weimar Bohlau*, 1939 vii, 83 pp

Gortner, Richard — Die drei Wertstufen des Wahren, Schönen und Guten in der deutschen Klassik Studie zum Humanitäts ideal Diss *Bonn* 1939 99 pp

Groth, Helge — Dichter des Humanismus im heutigen Deutschland 1 Hermann Hesse, Hans Carossa, Ernst Wiechert, Karl Benno von Mechow *Berlin Pfau*, 1939 236 pp M 780

Guardini, Romano — Holderlin Weltbild und Frömmigkeit *Leipzig Hegner*, 1939 568 pp M 1250

— über Wilhelm Raabes "Stopfkuchen" 2 durchgearb Aufl *Würzburg Werkbund-Verl* [1939] 83 pp M 250

Guggisberg, Kurt — Jeremias Gotthelf Christentum und Leben *Zürich Niehans* [1939] 285 pp M 4

Hebbel-Jahrbuch — Im Auftrag der Hebbel-gemeinde hrsg durch Detlef Colln *Heide Westholsteinische Verlags Anstalt* [1939] 126 pp M 240

Hebel, Johann Peter — Briefe Gesamtausgabe Hrsg und eilautert von Wilhelm Zentner *Karlsruhe C F Muller* [1939] xxi, 805 pp M 10

Heesch, Kathe — Gottfried Kellers "Gruener Heinrich" als Bildungsroman des deutschen Realismus Diss [Dichtung, Wort u Sprache H 4] *Hamburg Hansischer Gildenverlag*, 1939 65 pp M 3

Heinlein, Otto — August Bohse-Talander als Romanschriftsteller der galanten Zeit Diss *Greifswald Bochum-Longendree: Poppinghaus*, 1939 146 pp

Heinzerling, Jakob, u Reuter, Hermann — Siegerländer Worterbuch Hrsg im Auftrag des Vereins für Heimatkunde und Heimat-schutz im Siegerlande samt Nachbargebieten zu Siegen Mit 18 Abbildungen im Text, 31 Wort- und Lautkarten und 1 Kirchspiel- und Amterkarte *Siegen Vorlander* 1932-1938 xxiv, 354 pp 4° M 1860

Heyderhoff, Julius — Die Hausgeister von Pempelfort Familien- und Freundschaftsbriege des Jacobi-Hauses Gesammelt und herausgegeben Mit 6 Bildtafeln *Dusseldorf Schwann*, 1939 84 pp 4° M 4

Hildebrandt, Heinrich — Die Staatsauf-fassung der schlesischen Barockdramatiker im Rahmen ihrer Zeit Diss [Rostocker Studien, H 6] *Rostock: Hinstorff* [1939] 178 pp M 3

Hoche, Alfred E.—Die Geisteskranken in der Dichtung *München* J. F. Lehmann [1939] 43 pp M 1

Hühne, Margot — Die Alexanderepen Rudolfs von Ems und Ulrichs von Eschenbach Diss Jena *Wurzburg* Triltsch, 1939 iii, 194 pp M 450

Hugelmann, Hans — Paul Ernst Wirklichkeit, Weltanschauung und Prosaform Diss [Erlanger Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur 13] *Erlangen* Palm & Enke, 1939 viii, 173 pp M 550

Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur Hrsg im Auftrag der Preuss Akad der Wiss von der Literaturarchiv Ges in Berlin N F Bd 15 Bibliographie 1935 *Berlin* de Gruyter, 1939 304 pp M 20

Jappe, Hajo — Jugend deutschen Geistes Das Bild des Junglings in der Blüte der deutschen Dichtung *Berlin* de Gruyter, 1939 444 pp M 11

Kaestner, Walter — Die deutschen Lehnwörter im Polnischen 1 Einleitung und Lautlehre Diss Hamburg [Veröffentlichungen des Slavischen Instituts an der Friedrich-Wilhelms Univ Berlin 23] *Leipzig* Harrassowitz, 1939 xxviii, 131 pp M 6

Kallenberg, Elisabeth — Das Bild des Menschen im Werke Holderlins Diss Münster Teildruck *Berlin* Pfau, 1939 82 pp

Klett, Ada M — Der Streit um "Faust II" seit 1900 Mit kommentierter Bibliographie von 512 Titeln [Jenaer germanistische Forschungen Bd 33] *Jena* Frommann, 1939 216 pp M 680

Kobielski, Paul — Jean Pauls Spätstil Diss *Köln* Welzel-Druck, 1939 46 pp

Kothe, Josef — Die deutschen Osterlieder des Mittelalters Diss *Breslau* Nischkowsky, 1939 x, 132 pp

Kuhlmann, Erich — Der niederdeutsche Mensch bei Christian Dietrich Grabbe Ein Beitrag zur Wesensbestimmung des nordisch bestimmten deutschen Menschen Diss Bonn *Bottrop* W Postberg, 1939 113 pp

Kuhlmann, Walter — Deutsche Aussprache Lehr- und Lesebuch für Ausländer 2 verb Aufl [Germanische Bibliothek Abt 1, Reihe 3, Bd 12] *Heidelberg* Winter, 1939 viii, 40, 39 pp M 285

Langenbuecher, Hellmuth — Die deutsche Gegenwartsdichtung Eine Einführung in das volkhaft Schriftum unserer Zeit Mit 16 Dichterbildern *Berlin* Junker & Dunhaupt, 1939 238 pp M 280

Laqua, Hans — Warum Karl May? Wirkung und Wert eines Volksschriftstellers Vortrag *Radebeul* Karl-May-Verlag [1939] 32 pp 25 Pf

Loock, Wilhelm — Die Gestalt des Politikers bei C F Meyer Diss *Marburg* Bauer, 1938 59 pp

Low, Wilhelm — Paul Ernsts Auffassung vom Amt des Dichters Ein Beitrag zur Deutung des Grundgefühls seiner theoretischen Schriften Diss *Marburg* *Hilchenbach* W Wesener, 1938 113 pp

Martin, Bernhard — Die deutschen Mundarten Mit 13 Abbildungen [Hochschulwissen in Einzeldarstellungen] *Leipzig* Quelle & Meyer, 1939 viii, 159 pp M 340

— Streifzüge durch Waldeck's Mundarten [Waldeckisches Volkstum Bd 3] *Korbach* Bing, 1937 51 pp M 1

Mayer, Anton — Der Gottergleiche Erinnerungen an Rudolf G Binding Mit 2 Bildtafeln *Potsdam* Rutten & Loening, 1939 94 pp M 180

Meder, Hugo — Die erzählenden Werke von Emil Strauss Diss *Frankfurt* *Limbürg* Vereinsdruckerei, 1938 93 pp

Mell, Max. — Adalbert Stifter *Leipzig*: Insel-Verl 1939 72 pp 80 Pf

Merkel, G D — Die Epochen der deutschen Schriftsprache [Nationale und Kapodistrische Universität Athen, Philosophische Fakultät Deutsche Philologie II] *Athen*: 1939 55 pp

Merseburger Zaubersprüche, Die, hrsg vom Landeshauptmann der Provinz Sachsen (Den Mitgliedern und Gästen der "Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen (Weimar)" gewidmet anlässlich der Tagung in der Provinz Sachsen und ihres Besuchs in Merseburg am 2 Juli 1939) [Halle Brandt, 1939] 29 pp 4° 250 copies

Millotat, Heinz — Rudolf G Bindings erzahltes Werk Diss *Marburg* *Wurzburg* Triltsch, 1939 94 pp M 3

Minssen, Bernhard — Der ältere Friedrich Schlegel Untersuchungen auf Grund der Umarbeitung der "Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur von 1822" Diss *Breslau* *Bleicherode* Neft, 1939 83 pp M 340

Palmer, Philip Motley — Neuweltwörter im Deutschen [Germanische Bibliothek, 2 Abt Untersuchungen und Texte 42] *Heidelberg* Winter, 1939 174 pp M 960

Powell, Percival Hugh — Pierre Corneilles Dramen in deutschen Bearbeitungen und auf der deutschen Bühne bis zum Anfang des 19 Jhs, und deren Verhältnis zur zeitgenössischen Literatur in Deutschland Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des deutschen Dramas und Theaters im 17 u 18 Jh Diss *Rostock* *Emdetten* (Westf). Lechte, 1939 135 pp

Pradel, Johannes — Studien zum Prosastil Clemens Brentanos Ein Beitrag zur Wesensbestimmung romantischen Formwillens Diss *Breslau* [Junge Forschung H 6] *Halle* Akad Verl 1939 169 pp M. 490

Preissl, Fritz — Hrotsvith von Gandersheim und die Entstehung des mittelalterlichen Heldenbilds Diss [Erlanger Arbeiten zur deutschen Literatur 12] *Erlangen* Palm & Enke, 1939 61 pp M 2 50

Reifferscheidt, F — Über die Sprache *Leipzig* Hegner, 1939 198 pp M 5 50

Reis, Arnold Mathias — Wilhelm von Scholz Studien zu seiner Weltanschauung Diss Bonn *Wurzburg* Triltsch, 1938 95 pp

Ropke, Werner — Studien zur Entwicklung Wilhelm Raabes Diss Frankfurt *Braunschweig* Westermann, 1938 79 pp

Ruegenberg, Gottfrieda — Paul Flemming Versuch einer Darstellung seiner Dichtungsmotive und seiner Sprache Diss Köln *Wurzburg* Triltsch, 1939 110 pp

Rutt, Theodor — Selbsterziehung und Selbstbildung im Leben und in den Werken Adalbert Stifters Diss Köln Orthen, 1939 76 pp

Schell, Hans — Das Verhältnis von Form und Gehalt in Goethes "Pandora" Diss Münster *Wurzburg* Triltsch, 1939 134 pp M 3

Schenck, Ernst von — E T A Hoffmann Ein Kampf um das Bild des Menschen *Berlin* Die Runde, 1939 xviii, 754 pp M 12

Schmitt, K — Litteraturgeschichtlicher Abriss der Pfälzer Mundartdichtung (nebst Sprachbetrachtungen) Diss München *Heidelberg* Lippl, 1939 79 pp

Schnelle, Anna M — Die Staatsauffassung in Anton Ulrichs "Aramena" im Hinblick auf La Calprenède's "Cléopâtre" Diss *Beim* Pfau, 1939 87 pp M 3

Sembdner, Helmut — Die Berliner Abendblätter Heinrich von Kleists, ihre Quellen und ihre Redaktion Diss [Schriften der Kleist Gesellschaft Bd 19] *Berlin* Weidmann, 1939 16, 402 pp

Siebert, Werner — Der alte Stefan George *Mainz* Hanns Marxen [1939] 54 pp M 3 40

Spanner, Werner. — Das Märchen als Gattung Diss [Gessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie 68] *Gessen* von Münchow, 1939 43 pp M 2 50

Stapf, Paul — Jean Paul und Stifter Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des jungen Stifter [Germanische Studien H 208] *Berlin* Ebering, 1939 66 pp M 2 80

Stearns, Harold Everett Jr — Germany's Military Heroes of the Napoleonic Era in Her Post-War Historical Drama Currents of German Nationalism in Recent Historical Plays Diss Univ of Michigan [1939] 147 pp

Steche, Theodor. — Das Rabenschlachtgedicht, das Buch von Bern und die Entwicklung der Dietrichsage Habilitations-

Schrift [Deutsches Werden H 16] *Greifswald* Bamberg, 1939 292 pp M 6 50

Steiner, Elisabeth [Schwester M Petronia, O P] — Gleichheit und Abweichungen im Wortschatz der altd. Bibelglossen und der zusammenhängenden Bibeltexte Diss München *Speyer* Pilger-Druckerei, 1939 ix, 353 pp

[Stockli, Alban] — Rudolf der Schreiber von Ins, nicht von Ems *Wohlen* (*Aargau*) K Meyer's Sohne, 1939 51 pp M 2

Stoelzel, Elisabeth — Holderlin in Tübingen und die Anfänge seines Hyperion Diss *Kiel* *Tübingen* Becht, 1938 iv, 127 pp

Stoffers, Wilhelm — Juden und Ghetto in der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Weltkrieges Diss Nijmegen [Aus Deutsche Quellen und Studien Bd 12] *Graz* Stiasny, 1939 800 pp M 24

Stuhlfauth, Georg — Die Bildnisse des Hans Sachs von 16 bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts Mit 42 Abbildungen *Berlin* F Kupferberg [1939] 53 pp M 2 80

Stuhlmann, Friedrich — Die Sprache des Heeres Eine heeresgeschichtlich-sprachliche Untersuchung *Berlin* Traditions Verlag [1939] 86 pp M 2 50

Stuyver, Wilhelmina — Deutsche expressionistische Dichtung im Lichte der Philosophie der Gegenwart *Amsterdam* J H Paris, 1939 222 pp Fl 3 75

Tempeanu, Virgil — Sippenfeindschaft und Wiedervergeltung im Nibelungenlied *Bukarest* Zweier, 1938 140 pp M 2

Thomas, Helmuth — Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung der Spruchdichtung Frauenlobs Diss Berlin [Palaestra 217] *Leipzig* Akad Verlagsgesellschaft, 1939 xix, 231 pp M 19 60

Timmermann, Ernst — Peter Hille Persönlichkeit und Werk Diss Köln Picks, 1939 143 pp

Tinnefeld, Eleonore — Der soziale Kampf in der deutschen Arbeiterdichtung Diss *Leipzig* *Düsseldorf* Dobler [1938] 77 pp

Veil, Wolfgang H — Goethe als Patient Mit 2 Bildtafeln *Jena* Fischer, 1939 71 pp M 2

Vietor, Karl — Georg Buchner als Politiker *Bern* Haupt, 1939 134 pp Fr 6

Voigt, Alfred — Umriss einer Staatslehre bei Johann Gottfried Herder [Königsberger rechtswissenschaftliche Forschungen Bd 3] *Stuttgart* Kohlhammer, 1939 56 pp M 2 80

Wanner, Georg — Die Mundarten des Kantons Schaffhausen T 1 Hrsg von Hans Wanner (Schaffhausen, Kantons-Schule, Jahresbericht, 1939 Beilage) [*Frauenfeld* Huber, 1939] viii, 83 pp 1 plate

Weihe, Amalie. — Der junge Eichendorff und Novalis' Naturpantheismus Diss Marburg [Germanische Studien H 210]. Berlin Ebering, 1939 96 pp M 3 90

Wiese, Benno von — Herder Grundzüge seines Weltbildes [Meyers kleine Handbücher 19] Leipzig Bibliographisches Institut [1939] 144 pp M 2 60

Zemp, Werner — Morike Elemente und Anfänge Diss Zurich [Wege zur Dichtung Bd 33] Frauenfeld, Leipzig Huber, 1939 163 pp M 3 60

### FRENCH

Abercrombie, N J — Saint Augustine and Fr Classical Thought Oxford Clarendon Press, 1938 iii + 123 pp

Barbeau, M — Romancéro du Canada London Macmillan, 1938

Beck, J et L — Le MS du Roi *Philadelphie* U of Pa Press, 1938

Becker, Ph A — Das Werden der Wilhelm- u der Aimerigeste Leipzig Hirzel, 1938 iv + 208 pp

Bendel, H — Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Mundart von Lescun Tübingen diss, 1938 138 pp

Bestmann, Fr — Die lautliche Gestaltung englischer Ortsnamen im Altfranz u Anglo-normannischen Paris Ditz, 1938 xxi + 215 pp

Bley, L — Auffassung u Gestaltung des Problems der Entwurzelung in M Barrès' "Les déracinés" Heidelberg diss, 1938 56 pp

Bo, C — Delle immagini giovanili di Sainte-Beuve Florence Parenti, 1938 517 pp

Bremer, K H — Der franz Nationalismus Berlin Deutscher Rechtsverlag, 1939 137 pp

Brinkmann, W — Bienenstock u Bienenstand in den roman Ländern Hamburg Hans Gildenverlag, 1938 xv + 200 pp

Cappiello, L — La poesia francese dalle origini a Malherbe Bari Soc ed tipografica, 1938 118 pp

Chisholm, A R — An Approach to M Valéry's *Jeune Parque* Melbourne and Oxford U Presses, 1938

Clerc, C — Portrait de Philippe Bridel Lausanne Payot, 1938

Cremonte, L — Proust Il tempo perduto e ritrovato Florence La nuova Italia, 1938 107 pp

Crowley, F. I. — Voltaire's "Poème sur la loi naturelle" Berkeley Calif U Press, 1938

Fiebig, W — Das "Livre d'Enanctet" nach der einzigen Hs 2585 der Wiener Nationalbibliothek Leipzig. Gronau, 1938. xlviii + 160 pp.

Dust, Agnes — Die Magdalenenszenen im

franz u provenz geistlichen Spiel des Mittelalters Munster diss, 1938 105 pp

Ferraris, M — Il romanzo contemp della Svizzera fr Turin Gambino, 1938. 210 pp

Franzén, Torsten — Etude sur la syntaxe des pronoms personnels sujets en ancien fr Upsala diss, 1939 165 pp

Gass, K-E — A de Rivalet (1753 1801) Hagen i Westf Baake, 1938 iv + 274 pp

Gohlert, Fr — Die franz Provinz im Leben u Werk H de Balzacs Halle diss, 1939 v + 102 pp

Goldsmith, Marg — Mme de Staël New York Longmans, 1938 xii + 276 pp.

Grassl, M — Die Musik in den Werken des J-K Huysmans Munich diss, 1939 276 pp

Guillaume de Loris et Jean de Meung — Le roman de la rose, v 1-956 Turin Viretto, 1938 38 pp

Heussler, Fr — Hyperkorrekte Sprachformen in den Mundarten der franz Schweiz Basel diss, 1939 83 pp

Heyns, K — Wohnkultur, Alp- u Forstwirtschaft im Hochtal der Garonne Ham burg Hans Gildenverlag, 1938 xvi + 165 pp

Jaesrich, H — Die franz Lit im Spiegel der Hist de France J Michelets Bonn diss, 1939 83 pp

Jarman, L M — The Goncourt Bros Modernists in abnormal psychology U of New Mex Bull, 1939 52 pp

Krabbe, L — Das Problem der Fiau in den Romanen von Palacio Valdés Munster diss, 1938 62 pp

Langescheid, H — Das Dorf Souancé-aupérche Hamburg Hans Gildenverlag, 1938 xii + 75 pp

Lugli, V — Il prodigio di La Fontaine Messina Principato, 1939. 273 pp

May, J L — Fénelon London. Burns Oates, 1938 xi + 207 pp

Mowat, R B — J-J Rousseau Bristol. Arrowsmith, 1938 368 pp

Pellegrini, A — Baudelaire Milan Treves, 1938 263 pp

Pierson, G W. — Tocqueville and Beaumont in America New York Oxford U Press, 1938 xx + 852 pp

Schafer, K — F J de Pierre, Cardinal de Bernis, als Schriftsteller u Mensch, 1715 94 Berlin diss, 1939 98 pp

Schaerh, E — L'Inspecteur Hornleigh sur la piste Boston Heath (1939). 96 pp

Schubert, Willy. — Vom Stil des Rabelais-schen Satzbaues Heidelberg diss, 1938 72 pp

Trojandt, G — Das Italienerlebnis bei Frau v Stael u Henri Beyle. Göttingen diss, 1938 108 pp



Wandruszka v Wanstetten, M W.—Nord u Sud im franz Geistesleben *Leipzig* Gronau, 1939 iv + 245 pp

Weber, Edwart — Die Bedeutung der Analogie für die Beschäftigung H Estiennes mit der Vulgarsprache Marburg diss, 1939 96 pp

Whitfield, Irene T.—La Fr Folk Songs *University, La* La State U Press, 1939 xiv + 159 pp \$3 00 (Romance Lang Series, 1)

Wieder, J.—J Bainville *Breslau* Priebsch, 1939 x + 203 pp

Wigand, Ruth — Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte von "prud'homme" Marburg diss, 1939 103 pp

### ITALIAN

Alessio, G.—Saggio di toponomastica calabrese *Firenze* Olschki, 1939 xxxvi + 505 pp L 150

Altana, Giuseppe, Gualazzini, Ugo; Gatta, F. S.—Il museo e i manoscritti di Lazzaro Spallanzani esistenti in Reggio Emilia *Reggio Emilia* Costi, 1939 49 pp

Antonibon, Francesca — Le relazioni a stampa di Ambasciatori Veneti *Padova*. Tip del Seminario, 1939 151 pp

Apostoliti, P. — Sintesi della letteratura italiana contemporanea *Milano*: "Quaderni di poesia," 1939 96 pp L. 6

Bertoni, Giulio — Lingua e cultura *Firenze* Olschki, 1939 301 pp. L 30

Caggese, R.—Il Duecento e il Trecento Dal concordato di Worms alla fine della prigionia di Avignone (Grande Storia d'Italia) *Torino*. U T E T, 1939 viii + 538 pp 300 illustr, leg L 85

Colucci, Benedetto — Scritti inediti di Benedetto Colucci da Pistoia, a cura di Arsenio Frugoni *Firenze*. Olschki, 1939. xviii + 88 pp L 30

Costanzi, O. — Il pensiero religioso di Vittorio Alfieri. *Roma*. "Ausonia," 1939. 80 pp. L 8.

Foscolo, Ugo. — Lettere inedite di Ugo Foscolo e Marzia Martinengo, a cura di Arturo Marpicati. Con un saggio sul Foscolo a Brescia. *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1939. viii + 386 pp. con 24 tavv L 18

— Scritti militari Introduzione e commento di G Berzero *Firenze*: Le Monnier, 1939 xxxii + 162 pp L. 12 50.

Galbiati, G.—Dizionario leonardesco Repertorio generale delle voci e cose contenute nel Codice Atlantico con aggiunta di sei disegni inediti del codice stesso, di passi trascritti e di indici speciali *Milano*: Hoepli, 1939. xvi + 196 pp. con 10 tavv L. 100

Getto, Giovanni.—Saggio letterario su S. Caterina da Siena. *Firenze*. Sansoni, 1939 viii + 163 pp. L. 20.

Ginori Conti, Piero — Bibliografia delle opere del Savonarola Vol I Cronologia e bibliografia delle prediche, con contributi storici e filologici di Roberto Ridolfi *Firenze* Olschki, 1939 viii + 165 pp e con 15 tavole fuori testo L 100

Malagoli, L.—Guicciardini *Firenze*: "La Nuova Italia," 1939 244 pp L 16

Palazzi, F.—Nuovissimo Dizionario della lingua italiana *Milano*. Ceschina, 1939 1374 pp L 58

Savj-Lopez, P.—Le origini neolatine, a cura di P E Guarnerio Ristampa della edizione 1920 *Milano*. Hoepli, 1939 L 16

Taramelli, A.—Bibliografia romano-sarda Nota introduttiva di C Galassi Paluzzi *Roma* Istituto di studi romani, 1939 86 pp L 25

Torre Franca, F.—Il segreto del Quattrocento Musiche ariose e poesia popolare *Milano* Hoepli, 1939 xxiv + 610 pp di musiche in partitura, 16 fac-simili e 5 appendici L 130

### SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Aguilera, F.—Pubs on the Lang and Lit of Sp America and Brazil in 1937 *Cambridge* Harvard U Press, 1938

Arvelo, R A — Historia y crítica de la novela en Venezuela *Leipzig*. Pries, 1938 173 pp

Azorin — El Licenciado vidriera, ed Margarita de Mayo *New York* Oxford U Press, 1939 xx + 143 pp \$1 00

Blasi, F.—Epoepa-spagnuola. *Modena* Soc tip Modenese, 1938

Boselli, C — Spagna Langue, dialetti, folclore *Milan*: Le Langue estere, 1939 181 pp

Costanzo, L — D Giovanni Tenorio nel teatro spagnolo e romeno *Naples*. Guida, 1939 x + 153 pp

Delogu, F M.—Cervantes, La tragicomedia di Calisto e Melibea *Messina*. Principato, 1938 289 pp

Gallop, R.—Cantares do Povo Português *Lisbon*. Augener, 1938

Gregor, J — Das spanische Welttheater *Munch* Piper, 1938 536 pp

Guernieri, Cr. C.—La lirica del Camões *Genoa*. Degli Orfini, 1938 109 pp

Moll, R.-I.—Beitrage zu einer krit Ausgabe des altspan. Libro de Alexandre Berlin diss, 1938 132 pp.

Murrieta, B P M.—El lenguaje peruano. *Lima* U Católica, 1938.

Plácido, A. R. — Impresiones literarias. *Montevideo* Monteverde, 1938

Zaldumbide, G — Montalvo *New York*: Inst de las Españas, 1938

# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume LV

MARCH, 1940

Number 3

---

---

## ROUSSEAU ET LES RÉFORMATEURS DU THÉÂTRE

Parmi les nombreux problèmes que soulève la *Lettre sur les spectacles* (1758) il y en a un auquel on a prêté fort peu d'attention. Quelle a été l'influence de cet ouvrage sur le théâtre, en particulier sur les auteurs dramatiques partisans du genre sérieux? Sans doute c'est Diderot qui fut le principal théoricien du drame et Rousseau venait de rompre avec lui. Malgré cela les défenseurs du théâtre épuré doivent énormément à Rousseau et l'on est même forcé de constater, avec quelque surprise d'abord que, tout en reprenant quelques idées de Diderot, ils aiment à se réclamer de l'autorité de Rousseau. Que pour la nouvelle génération il n'y eût aucun désaccord entre les théories de Diderot et les idées de Rousseau, cela n'a guère été remarqué et l'influence de Rousseau sur les réformateurs du théâtre est restée mal expliquée. Relevons cependant que Jules Lemaître déjà avait indiqué quelques analogies<sup>1</sup> et surtout que Marguerite Moffat, dans sa thèse sur *Rousseau et la querelle du théâtre au 18<sup>e</sup> siècle*, constate une étroite parenté entre les idées exprimées dans la *Lettre à d'Alembert* et celles de Thorel de Campigneulle, Nouel de Buzonnière, Beaumarchais, Restif de la Bretonne, Louis Sébastien Mercier et Cubières qui sont tous partisans du théâtre réformé<sup>2</sup>. Voilà une liste d'auteurs imposante et leurs écrits qui s'échelonnent sur une vingtaine d'années indiquent un courant bien marqué. Miss Moffat, tout en reconnaissant que ces auteurs sont des admirateurs passionnés de Rousseau, a cependant cru voir dans leurs essais sur le théâtre des réfutations de la thèse de Rousseau. Il y a là une interprétation peu satisfaisante car on n'a l'habitude d'écrire contre les maîtres qu'on admire.

<sup>1</sup> Voir "Jean Jacques et le théâtre," *Impressions de théâtre*, t. 6, p. 138.

<sup>2</sup> Paris, Boccard, 1930, pp. 224-245, 265-272, 326.

Pour arriver à une explication moins contradictoire de ce problème nous examinerons d'abord les opinions de Rousseau sur le drame, puis nous verrons ce que ces auteurs pensaient de Rousseau

C'était une habitude de Rousseau, dès qu'il abordait une question, d'élever le débat et de faire intervenir, à propos de telle circonstance particulière, les idées maîtresses de sa philosophie. Nous savons que ce fut le cas pour *l'Emile* qui devait n'être qu'un programme d'éducation pour guider une jeune mère et que la *Lettre à d'Alembert* fut composée pour empêcher l'établissement d'un théâtre à Genève. Si on veut bien comprendre le point de vue de Rousseau et de ses disciples, il ne faut point oublier qu'il traite, dans la première partie de cet ouvrage, au moins deux questions qui n'ont entre elles aucun rapport nécessaire et permanent : une question générale, celle de la valeur morale du théâtre, et une question particulière, celle de la moralité du théâtre français. C'est précisément pour n'avoir pas tenu compte de l'indépendance de ces deux questions qu'on n'a pas, en général, songé à étudier l'influence de Rousseau sur le théâtre. On le prenait pour un ennemi déclaré des spectacles, ce qui est aussi faux que de croire qu'il ait invité les Parisiens à reprendre la vie des sauvages.<sup>3</sup>

C'est contre Voltaire et les autres philosophes que s'élève Rousseau en déclarant que les spectacles, même s'ils étaient parfaits, ne pourraient pas devenir la source principale sinon unique de la morale privée et publique.<sup>4</sup> Sauf Mercier, qui est d'accord avec Rousseau,<sup>5</sup> les réformateurs ne se sont guère occupés de la valeur morale du théâtre en général et nous pouvons laisser cette question de côté.

Ayant réfuté la thèse de ceux qui déclarent le théâtre nécessaire à la morale, Rousseau passe à l'examen de la moralité du théâtre français. C'est par ses critiques de la tragédie et de la comédie qu'il a exercé son influence et il nous faut au moins indiquer ses conclusions. Les tragédies nous montrent surtout des scélérats triomphants (Atrée, Mahomet) ou encore des passions horribles (Phèdre, Médée). Tous ces personnages sont d'ailleurs si loin de

<sup>3</sup> Sur ce sujet voir la préface de *Narcisse*, *Lettre à d'Alembert*, éd. L. Brunel, Paris, Hachette, pp. 99-100, *Correspondance générale*, éd. Th. Dufour, t. 4, p. 139 (Lettre de Vernet à Rousseau du 24 nov. 1758 et *ibid.* p. 153 la réponse de Rousseau du 18 déc. 1758).

<sup>4</sup> Voir F. Gaiffe, *Le drame au 18<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 78-92, Bédard, *Mercier*, p. 154, 166-170.

<sup>5</sup> Voir *Du théâtre*, Amsterdam, 1773, pp. 5-6.

nous et les situations où ils se trouvent si extraordinaires que le spectateur ne songe jamais à en tirer une morale pratique<sup>6</sup> Quant à la comédie "dont les mœurs ont avec les nôtres un rapport plus immédiat, et dont les personnages ressemblent mieux à des hommes," la morale en est franchement mauvaise Au lieu de chercher à corriger les vices elle se contente, le plus souvent, d'attaquer les ridicules et consiste surtout à nous faire rire des fripons habiles qui dupent les honnêtes gens<sup>7</sup> Il est à noter que l'argumentation de Rousseau se concentre presque entièrement autour des genres établis en quoi elle n'est pas très originale En effet, les témoignages de l'époque prouvent abondamment que ces œuvres ne satisfont plus le goût du public<sup>8</sup>

Reste à savoir ce que Rousseau pensait des genres nouveaux. Il en parle peu et toujours très superficiellement,<sup>9</sup> comme s'il avait hâte d'en avoir fini avec un sujet où il n'est pas à l'aise Il déclare que les auteurs qui font des pièces plus épurées ennui et, plus loin, tout en admettant qu'un homme de génie pourrait inventer "un genre de pièces préférable à ceux qui sont établis," il prévoit que "ce nouveau genre ayant besoin pour se soutenir des talents de l'auteur, périra nécessairement avec lui."<sup>10</sup> Il va de soi que cette supposition, qui s'explique par son animosité contre Diderot,<sup>11</sup> est toute arbitraire et que le jugement porté sur la comédie larmoyante est exagéré en ce qu'il ne tient nul compte du succès immense obtenu par Nivelle de la Chaussée.<sup>12</sup> C'est là comme qui

<sup>6</sup> Voir *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p 53 Plus loin, faisant l'analyse de *Bérénice*, il constate que le spectateur porte tout son intérêt sur l'amour de Bérénice sans songer jamais à tirer une leçon du dénouement "La reine, dit-il, part sans le congé du parterre l'empereur la renvoie invitatus invitam, on peut ajouter *invito spectatore* Titus a beau rester Romain, il est seul de son parti, tous les spectateurs ont épousé Bérénice" *Ibid* p 83

<sup>7</sup> Voir *ibid*, pp 53-55

<sup>8</sup> Voir GaiFFE, *op cit* pp 15-23, *id* *Le rire et la scène française*, Paris, Boivin, 1931, pp 133-136

<sup>9</sup> Rousseau ne mentionne pas Marivaux En avocat habile il sait éviter ce qui pourrait nuire à sa thèse

<sup>10</sup> *Lettre sur les spectacles*, éd Brunel, p 43

<sup>11</sup> Diderot n'a pas manqué de s'en plaindre amèrement Rousseau "dit du mal de la comédie larmoyante, écrit il, parce que c'est mon genre . " Voir Grimm, *Correspondance*, éd Tourneux, t 16, p 221

<sup>12</sup> Voir Lanson, *Nouvelle de la Chaussée*, Paris, 1887, pp 267 et suiv Il est significatif que, pour réfuter la thèse de Rousseau, le marquis de Ximénès choisit précisément divers exemples dans la comédie larmoyante Voir Moffat, *op cit*, p 123

dirait l'attitude officielle de Rousseau au moment où il écrit sa lettre. Mais tâchons de découvrir ce qu'il pensait vraiment des genres nouveaux.

Dans beaucoup d'endroits de la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, et presque involontairement, il trahit une secrète préférence pour le drame bourgeois. Sur un point capital d'abord. Ayant constaté qu'au théâtre "l'objet principal est de plaire," il continue, comme à regret, en disant "Cela seul empêchera toujours qu'on ne puisse donner à ces sortes d'établissements *tous les avantages dont ils seroient susceptibles*"<sup>13</sup>. Voilà une concession qui peut mener loin. En effet, si jusqu'ici le but du théâtre avait bien été de plaire, la sensibilité ayant transformé les goûts du public, on entend dire de tous les côtés, et de plus en plus haut, que le but du théâtre doit être moral. L'objet principal n'est plus de plaire, il s'agit d'instruire.<sup>14</sup>

Au point de vue théorique il est donc incontestable que le but moral assigné au théâtre devait convenir beaucoup mieux à Rousseau. Mais il avait déclaré aussi qu'il était impossible de réussir au théâtre sans flatter les passions et les préjugés régnants. "Qu'on mette, pour voir, dit-il, sur la scène française un homme droit et vertueux, mais simple et grossier, . . . sans amour, sans galanterie, et qui ne fasse pas de belles phrases, qu'on y mette un sage sans préjugés, qui, ayant reçu un affront d'un spadassin, refuse de s'aller faire égorger par l'offenseur, j'aurai tort si l'on réussit"<sup>15</sup>. Ce "sage sans préjugés," imaginé par Rousseau, n'est-ce pas le héros de la comédie de Sedaine, *le Philosophe sans le savoir* (1765)?<sup>16</sup> Or, ce drame ayant eu un succès prolongé, Rousseau avait tort.

Nous avons d'autres indications, plus précises encore. Rousseau a lu *le Fils naturel* de Diderot et a écrit à Usteri qu'il le trouvait "tout à fait beau". De plus il connaissait *le Marchand de Londres*, cette pièce de Lillo où Diderot trouvait réalisées ses conceptions du drame bourgeois. Et Rousseau, aussi enthousiaste que Diderot,

<sup>13</sup> *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p. 26.

<sup>14</sup> M. Gaiffe dit que vers 1735 "le comique n'est plus en effet le but essentiel de la comédie, moraliser, analyser, émouvoir, voilà qui paraît désormais plus important que de faire rire." *Le rire* etc. p. 135. Voir aussi Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 116 et suiv.

<sup>15</sup> *Lettre sur les Spectacles*, p. 32 (note de Rousseau).

<sup>16</sup> Le premier titre de ce drame était "Le duel."

déclare que c'est "une pièce admirable, et dont la morale va plus directement au but qu'aucune pièce française que je connaisse"<sup>17</sup>

Ainsi il est manifeste que Rousseau n'adresse pas au drame bourgeois les mêmes critiques qu'aux genres établis. Des deux pièces sur lesquelles il porte un jugement il déclare l'une "tout à fait belle" et l'autre "admirable"<sup>18</sup>

Une dernière remarque s'impose. En appréciant les critiques de Rousseau on oublie trop de tenir compte de ce qu'elles contiennent de "républicain". Et cependant il est très évident que c'est le libre citoyen de la République de Genève, dont il se pose en défenseur, qui critique la société et la monarchie françaises. Ce qui lui déplaît dans les spectacles, plus encore que l'immoralité, c'est la leçon politique qui s'en dégage. On y fait admirer au peuple les crimes des rois et on l'invite à applaudir le mépris que montrent, pour les bourgeois et les paysans, des nobles orgueilleux et fripons. Sont-ce là les spectacles qu'il convient d'introduire chez un peuple qui a su conserver sa liberté? Que ce fût là le grief principal de Rousseau contre le théâtre français, c'est ce que nous affirme celui de ses disciples qui l'a le mieux connu personnellement. "Il fit la guerre à notre théâtre, dit Mercier, d'abord parce qu'il ressembloit au gouvernement. . . Son ouvrage *sur les spectacles* veut nous dire d'un bout à l'autre que la tragédie nationale n'appartient qu'à un peuple libre, et que nos compositions théâtrales sentent l'école de la servitude. . ."<sup>19</sup>

De toutes ces considérations il ressort clairement que Rousseau, souffrant encore de sa récente brouille avec Diderot, a forcé le ton de la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, entraîné qu'il était par son patriotisme genevois et sa haine pour Voltaire. Que tel ait été son cas, il n'a pas hésité à l'avouer à un de ses amis<sup>20</sup>

Il est d'ailleurs facile de confirmer cette thèse en rapprochant des idées exprimées dans la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, celles qu'il prête

<sup>17</sup> *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p. 88 (Note de Rousseau ajoutée à l'édition de 1782)

<sup>18</sup> Tout ceci est d'ailleurs fort naturel et Louis Riccoboni (1675-1753) qui avant Rousseau avait fait le procès des genres établis, avait lui aussi été un des premiers à porter aux nues le genre larmoyant, à son époque une révolution audacieuse. Voir Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 273

<sup>19</sup> *De Jean Jacques Rousseau*, Paris, 1791, t. 1, p. 14

<sup>20</sup> Voir *Correspondance générale*, t. 4, p. 153 (Lettre à Vernet du 18 déc. 1758)

à Saint-Preux dans *la Nouvelle Héloïse* dont la composition est antérieure à la queielle avec Diderot. Au lieu de représenter les combats de l'amour et de la vertu chez Sertorius, Pompée ou d'autres héros anciens, Saint-Preux voudrait que les tragédies contribuent à exciter dans les spectateurs l'amour de la patrie et de la liberté. La comédie, au lieu de reproduire "les conversations d'une centaine de maisons de Paris," devrait "représenter au naturel les mœurs du peuple," de tout le peuple, non celles d'une poignée d'impertinents "en habit doré" qui considèrent les bourgeois et les hommes du peuple comme des gens d'un autre monde<sup>21</sup>. En somme, ce que demande Saint-Preux, c'est que la tragédie soit nationale et la comédie populaire, ou, si l'on veut, bourgeoise.

De tout ceci retenons que dans *la Nouvelle Héloïse* Rousseau se montre très proche des théories de Diderot et que même dans la *Lettre à d'Alembert* on peut sentir, derrière les attaques contre les genres établis, une certaine préférence pour ce qu'on a appelé le genre sérieux. En définitive, Rousseau est moins l'ennemi du théâtre en général qu'opposé à l'établissement des spectacles à Genève, il nie la valeur morale du théâtre, mais c'est avant tout l'immoralité des genres traditionnels qu'il attaque. Cependant, comme il y aura toujours des spectacles à Paris, il vaudrait encore mieux qu'ils soient réformés suivant les suggestions de Saint-Preux.

La *Lettre à d'Alembert* a-t-elle favorisé ou retardé l'évolution naturelle du théâtre? En s'attachant uniquement aux réponses immédiates des philosophes offensés on a manqué de voir combien elle secondait les efforts des réformateurs. Après 1760 le drame représente la partie vivante du théâtre. Or, qu'est-ce que ce drame? Il est d'abord l'héritier de la Chaussée qui, à certains points de vue commença, comme dit Lanson, "l'œuvre que devait achever Rousseau"<sup>22</sup>. C'est le genre aussi qui, comme l'affirme M. Gaiffe, "va s'employer durant toute la fin du siècle à glorifier le sauvage et l'homme de la nature, à exalter les classes laborieuses, à revendiquer l'égalité des conditions et des sexes et à saper tous les préjugés sociaux"<sup>23</sup>. Il est donc clair que le drame va essentiellement chercher à porter sur la scène les principes défendus par Rousseau. Dès lors il n'y a pas lieu de s'étonner que les partisans du genre nouveau soient en même temps des disciples de Rousseau.

<sup>21</sup> Voir *Nouvelle Héloïse*, ed. Mornet, t. 2, pp. 338-342, IIe partie, Lettre 17.

<sup>22</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 147.

<sup>23</sup> Voir Gaiffe, *Le rire*, p. 152.

Marmontel, d'Alembert et quelques autres s'étaient empressés de protester contre les idées de Rousseau. Mais une dizaine d'années plus tard, alors que les divers auteurs dont nous avons cité la liste plus haut entrèrent en jeu, ils acceptèrent sans hésitation ce qui avait tellement révolté les ennemis de Rousseau en 1758<sup>24</sup>. Nous ne voulons pas reprendre séparément les idées de chacun de ces novateurs, ce qui serait bien inutile puisque, comme l'a déjà constaté Miss Moffat, ils se montrent tous d'accord avec Rousseau auquel ils empruntent leurs arguments. En effet, bien que d'une manière générale ils soient les continuateurs de Diderot, sur les points principaux, qu'il s'agisse de la critique des genres établis ou des principes du théâtre nouveau, ils se révèlent les vrais disciples de Rousseau.

Thorel de Campigneulles et Nouel de Buzonnière furent les premiers à reprendre les idées de Rousseau pour les mettre au service de leur thèse, la réforme morale du théâtre<sup>25</sup>. Mais laissons ces auteurs, oubliés aujourd'hui, pour en venir tout de suite à Beaumarchais. Dans *l'Essai sur le genre dramatique sérieux* (1767) il semble développer les théories de Diderot. On connaît la fameuse tirade contre la tragédie : "Que me font à moi, s'écrie-t-il, sujet paisible d'un Etat monarchique du 18<sup>e</sup> siècle, les révolutions d'Athènes et de Rome ? Quel intérêt véritable puis-je prendre . . . au sacrifice d'une princesse en Aulide ? Il n'y a dans tout cela . . . aucune moralité qui me convienne"<sup>26</sup>. Ce qu'on sait moins, c'est que cette déclaration lui est inspirée non par Diderot, mais par Rousseau. En effet, elle est précédée d'une citation de la *Lettre à d'Alembert* dont elle n'est qu'un développement audacieux<sup>27</sup>. Le

<sup>24</sup> Mercier est très conscient de cette différence entre les philosophes ennemis de Rousseau et les auteurs de la nouvelle génération. Parlant des réponses à la *Lettre à d'Alembert*, il dit : "Ceux qui voulurent alors lui répondre n'étoient pas nés ou formés pour le comprendre, un goût timide et resserré courboit alors toute la littérature. Des académies entières combattirent Rousseau, et Rousseau a dû sentir quelques mouvemens d'orgueil, en voyant les préjugés les plus misérables dominer des hommes qui vouloient combattre tous les autres préjugés, ce respect superstitieux qu'ils reprochoient à tant de fanatiques, ils le conservoient pour des formes puériles auxquelles ils étoient accoutumés". *De Jean Jacques Rousseau*, t. I, p. 14 et suiv. A ce sujet voir la thèse de R. Lowenstein, *Voltaire as an Historian of 17th Century French Drama*, Baltimore, 1935.

<sup>25</sup> Voir Moffat, *op. cit.* pp. 234-241.

<sup>26</sup> Cet essai sert de préface à la pièce intitulée *Eugénie*. Voir *Théâtre de Beaumarchais*, éd. Auger, Paris, 1857, p. 6.

<sup>27</sup> Voici le passage de Rousseau que cite Beaumarchais : "Ne seroit-il pas



cas de Sébastien Mercier est encore plus net. C'est lui-même qui nous apprend que son *Nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique* (1773) a été composé directement sous l'influence de Rousseau. Cet aveu est précieux, mais il était inutile. Nous sentons bien que Mercier n'est que l'écho de Saint-Pieux lorsqu'il dit que la tragédie française est devenue "une sorte de farce sérieuse, écrite avec pompe, qui vise à satisfaire l'oreille, mais qui ne dit rien à la nation" <sup>28</sup>

On n'est pas plus indulgent pour la comédie et personne ne vient prendre la défense de Molière contre Rousseau <sup>29</sup>. Au contraire, tous s'accordent à reprocher au grand comique d'avoir attaqué seulement les ridicules tandis que le but du théâtre doit être "de faire, comme dit Buzonnière, une guerre ouverte aux vices qui désolent la société, inspirer aux spectateurs des sentiments de vertu, et leur faire . . . aimer leur Patrie" <sup>30</sup>. Le seul point qu'on accorde à Molière, et là encore on ne fait que répéter Rousseau, c'est qu'il a osé peindre "des bourgeois et des artisans aussi bien que des marquis" alors que ses imitateurs ne savent que reproduire au théâtre les conversations du beau monde <sup>31</sup>.

Que fallait-il mettre à la place des comédies que l'on condamnait? Rousseau en avait parlé beaucoup moins. Cependant il est aisé de deviner à quelles sortes de pièces allaient ses préférences. "Le savoir, avant-il écrit, l'esprit, le courage, ont seuls notre admiration, et toi, douce et modeste vertu, tu restes toujours sans honneurs" <sup>32</sup>. Que fait Beaumarchais? Il veut mettre en scène "la vertu persécutée, victime de la méchanceté, mais toujours belle . . . et préférable à tout." <sup>33</sup>. Rousseau s'était-il plaint qu'au théâtre on ne sortît jamais des sphères aristocratiques de la société, qu'on n'y représentât rien qui pût plaire au peuple, il n'y avait qu'à faire le contraire. Ainsi Mercier déclare qu'un "drame, quelque parfait qu'on

a désirer que nos sublimes auteurs daignassent descendre un peu de leur continuelle élévation, et nous attendrir quelquefois sur la simple humanité souffrante, de peur que, n'ayant de pitié que pour des héros malheureux, nous n'en ayons jamais pour personne?" Voir *Lettre sur les spectacles*, p. 50.

<sup>28</sup> *Du théâtre, ou Nouvel essai sur l'art dramatique*, pp. 29-30, voir aussi *Nouvelle Héloïse*, IIe partie, Lettre 17 (éd. Moinet, t. 2, p. 343).

<sup>29</sup> Sur l'impopularité de Molière à cette époque, voir Gaiffe, *Le rire*, pp. 137-138.

<sup>30</sup> Cité dans Moffat, *op. cit.* p. 336.

<sup>31</sup> Voir Mercier, *Du théâtre*, p. 78, *Nouvelle Héloïse*, IIe partie, Lettre 17.

<sup>32</sup> *Lettre à d'Alembert*, p. 45.

<sup>33</sup> *Op. cit.* pp. 10-11.

le suppose, ne sauroit trop être à la portée du peuple, il ne pourroit même paroître parfait qu'en parlant éloquentement à la multitude" <sup>34</sup> Ailleurs il demande que le drame peigne les "mœurs actuelles de notre époque," qu'il plonge jusque "dans l'intérieur de nos maisons," bref, qu'il soit essentiellement "le tableau du siècle." <sup>35</sup>

"Le plaisir même du comique étant, d'après Rousseau, fondé sur un vice du cœur humain," tous ces réformateurs déclarent que le rire n'aura pas de place dans le drame. Pour rendre l'homme meilleur, il ne faut pas l'amuser, il faut le toucher. Ayant vu "la vertu persécutée," "je sors du spectacle, affirme Beaumarchais, meilleur que je n'y suis entré, par cela seul que j'ai été attendri" <sup>36</sup> Disons enfin que *le Philinte de Molière* (1790), de Fabre d'Eglantine, loin d'être un phénomène isolé, n'est que l'aboutissement d'une longue évolution. Dès 1758 les sujets dont Molière tirait des comédies avaient servi à faire des drames, pathétiques et attendrissants <sup>37</sup>. C'est donc bien simple, pour réformer le théâtre il s'agit d'employer sur la scène les moyens dont Rousseau avait usé avec tant de succès dans le roman.

Le rire et la gaîté éliminés au profit des larmes et de l'émotion, la correction des vices remplaçant celle des ridicules, et la peinture des classes moyennes et même des humbles, substituée à celle du monde aristocratique, voilà les réformes qu'on réclame et ce sont celles précisément que Rousseau avait demandées.

En conclusion rappelons que cette étude ne cherche aucunement à prouver que Rousseau fût le théoricien le plus important du drame. Tout ce que nous avons voulu montrer c'est qu'il y a, au sujet du théâtre, une parenté étroite entre ses idées et celles de Diderot. Cela est tout à fait évident si on se reporte à *la Nouvelle Héloïse* et c'est vrai aussi, jusqu'à un certain point, même de la *Lettre à d'Alembert* écrite après la rupture avec Diderot. Cela étant, les réformateurs du théâtre auraient pu, cela va de soi, se réclamer de l'un ou de l'autre. Mais il est certain que c'est à Rousseau plutôt qu'à Diderot qu'ils ont cherché à se rattacher.

EMANUEL VON DER MUHLL

Wilson College, Chambersburg

<sup>34</sup> *Du théâtre*, p. 200

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid* pp 103

<sup>36</sup> *Op cit* pp 10-11

<sup>37</sup> Voir à ce sujet Gaiffe, *Le drame au 18e siècle*, pp 102-103

AN EARLY FRENCH ADAPTATION OF AN ELIZABETHAN  
COMEDY J. B ROUSSEAU AS AN IMITATOR  
OF BEN JONSON

Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, that almost forgotten eighteenth-century poet, who was known as "le grand Rousseau" in the days before his reputation began to slip, owed his vogue mainly to his lyric poetry. Even in the time of his greatest renown he was considered a failure as a dramatist. That is probably the main reason why his posthumous play *L'Hypocondre, ou la femme qui ne parle point* has attracted little attention. He wrote it toward the end of his life, about 1733, and in that year, the following year and as late as 1739, two years before his death, he tried to arouse the interest of his friends and through them of the directors of the *Comédie française* in this new comedy, but in vain. One of the poet's friends, the abbé Séguy, when he published a posthumous edition of his works, apparently judged *L'Hypocondre* unworthy of being printed. It did not appear until 1751, when the so-called *Portefeuille de J.-B. Rousseau* was issued. It attracted no attention whatever and has not since. And yet this forgotten play is of considerable interest to us today: it is one of the first French imitations of an Elizabethan dramatist, the first French adaptation of a play by Ben Jonson.<sup>1</sup>

It is fairly well known that J. B. Rousseau had some contact with England and things English. He was in England twice, in 1698-1699<sup>2</sup> and in 1722-1723. It is not known whether he had any knowledge of the English language, but it is certain that he had some knowledge of English literature as early as 1716. In that year, in a letter to Brossette, he said, speaking of English plays:

Il est vrai qu'il n'y a ni rime ni raison dans toutes leurs pièces, de la manière qu'elles sont bâties, mais j'en ai vu plusieurs qui ne laisseraient pas de pouvoir servir de canevas à d'excellentes comédies, si elles étaient bien traitées.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that parts of Saint-Evremond's *Sur Polixène* (ca. 1662) are inspired by Ben Jonson's *Volpone*.

<sup>2</sup> If we are to believe a letter of Rousseau to Brossette (*Corresp. de J. B. Rousseau et de Brossette*, Paris, 1910, 2 vols., I, 90), he met Saint-Evremond during his first visit to England. His first knowledge of Jonson may have come from Saint-Evremond.

<sup>3</sup> *Correspondance de J. B. Rousseau et de Brossette*, I, 35.

The attitude expressed in the lines just quoted may explain partly why Rousseau wrote *L'Hypocondre*. The actual circumstances of its composition are given as follows by the editor of the *Portefeuille de J-B Rousseau*:

La comedie qu'on vient de lire est anglaise. Feu M D\*\*\*, gentilhomme anglais, homme d'esprit et d'érudition, à qui elle plaisait fort, l'a traduite en français pour la faire connaître à M. Rousseau, et le pria de la mettre en vers. Après l'avoir examinée, M. Rousseau en a changé tout le plan, pour tâcher de l'accommoder à notre théâtre. <sup>4</sup>

The English comedy which M. D\*\*\* had translated for Jean-Baptiste Rousseau and upon which he based his *Hypocondre* is Ben Jonson's *Epicoene, or the Silent Woman*. *The Silent Woman*, produced in 1609 or 1610, is the gayest of Jonson's comedies and has remained the most popular, if not the best-known and the most admired.

The play centers around Morose, an eccentric bachelor who has a horror of noise of all sorts and who takes ridiculous precautions to ensure silence around him. Morose has a nephew named Sir Dauphine Eugenie, whom he hates. He would like to marry and have an heir merely to disinherit his nephew, but he dreads the noise a wife would bring into the house. At the start of the play we learn, from a conversation between Dauphine and his friends Clerimont and Truewit, that Morose's barber Cutbeard has discovered a suitable wife for Morose, a silent young woman, and that this silent woman is to be presented to Morose that very day. Morose makes his first appearance on the stage at the beginning of the second act, and his extravagant obsession is shown, as well as his amusing method of having his servants communicate to him without words. Truewit then bursts in and deluges Morose with a torrent of words in which he waxes of the dire consequences of marrying. This makes Morose all the more determined, for he believes that Truewit has come in the interests of Dauphine. On Truewit's return to Dauphine we learn that the silent woman, whose name, incidentally, is Epicoene, is closely associated with the nephew, who is thus actually encouraging the marriage. Neither the audience nor the other characters are informed at that point as to the reason for this paradoxical situation. Epicoene is presented to Morose by the barber, and makes an excellent impression, remaining silent, or at most, murmuring a few words inaudibly. The marriage takes place in the third act, and immediately after it Epicoene changes, she begins to talk loudly, to assert herself, to give orders—all to the consternation of Morose. Truewit then reappears and, pretending to console Morose, overwhelms him again with a flood of words. At this point, to make Morose's despair complete, the machinations of Dauphine bring

---

<sup>4</sup> *Portefeuille de J. B. Rousseau*, Amsterdam, 1751, 2 vols., I, 379.

about the invasion of the hypochondriac's house by various comic characters, who have been previously introduced. For the remainder of the third act and most of the fourth the house is in tumult and Morose is frantic. Determined to get a divorce, he accepts the aid of Truewit, who offers to furnish legal advice. So, in the fifth act, Truewit produces Otter (a comic friend of his) and Cutbeard, disguised one as a theologian, the other as a lawyer, and with scraps of bad Latin they review before Morose the grounds for divorce, going so far as to persuade him to ask for one based upon grounds of impotence. They end up, however, by finding no satisfactory grounds, and Morose is at his wits' end. Dauphine then offers to find a solution if Morose will give him an annuity and promise of inheritance. As soon as Morose has signed the papers, Dauphine reveals that Epicoene is a man, and that hence the marriage is null.

This play, because of the conception of comedy upon which it is based (that is, a central figure who is ridiculous because he represents some trait of character carried to an extreme), is closest to Molière of all of Jonson's plays. Rousseau was violently opposed to the tendencies of French comedy about 1730, when Destouches, La Chaussée and Marivaux were reigning favorites, he was anxious to guide the French comic muse back to what he felt was the true comic tradition that represented by Molière. As we examine the manner in which he adapted Jonson's comedy we must keep that fact in mind.

The French poet kept the name Morose for the main character, called the nephew Léandre, suppressed Clerimont, and called Truewit Eutrapel. Epicoene was changed to Andriogyne, which may have seemed to the French poet to have a more easily grasped significance. The minor characters were cut down in numbers and were linked more closely to the main characters.

In general, as the changes made with regard to the characters suggest, the plot of the French play is simpler than the source, Rousseau obviously having decided to eliminate everything that seemed to him to violate the unities. Although the first acts of both plays contain the same amount of exposition, Rousseau did not keep Jonson's opening scene, in which Clerimont, Truewit and Dauphine converse wittily and entertainingly and bring in Morose and the situation involving him only incidentally and gradually. This may have seemed to the French poet to violate Boileau's rule

Que dès les premiers vers l'action préparée  
Sans peine du sujet aplanisse l'entrée

(*Art poétique*, III).

He substituted for this opening scene a monologue by the barber, followed by a scene between the barber and the nephew, both of which stick pretty much to exposition. There is a significant difference at the end of the first act. In Jonson's play, Truewit and the others cooperate with Dauphine mainly out of pure love of mischief, and, along with the audience, are kept in the dark with regard to the most important detail of Dauphine's plot (that is, the real nature of *Episcène*). In Rousseau's version the first act ends with Léandre promising, as he leaves the stage with Eutrapel, to give the details of the plot, which he does between the acts. These are not revealed to the audience, although the name *Androgyne* might serve as a fairly good clue.

In the second acts of both plays, the three most important scenes are similar: that is, the scenes between Morose and his servant, between Morose and his nephew's friend and the scene where the barber introduces the silent woman to Morose. It goes almost without saying that Rousseau maintains the unity of place, and thus is obliged to omit one of Jonson's scenes, that which takes place in Sir John Daw's house.

In the third and fourth acts the two plays are similar as far as the general lines of the plot go, but there are considerable differences in the details of the action. Rousseau has simplified a great deal. He certainly found a lack of unity of action, as he understood it, in Jonson's play. He would have decided that many details based upon conditions of London life in the Elizabethan period would have been unintelligible and probably repugnant to any French audience. He therefore suppressed such details, but he endeavored to keep the most important comic devices found in the third and fourth acts of his source: the sudden change in the silent woman, the ludicrous distress and frenzy of Morose, the hubbub caused by the invasion of uninvited guests. He kept whatever comic details of Jonson's he judged suitable and added others of his own of far from negligible quality to replace those he suppressed.

The highly effective and comic fifth act of Jonson was adapted by Rousseau with little change. The French poet shortened it—especially by cutting down greatly the amount of Latin used by the supposed authorities on divorce whom Morose consults. It is interesting to note that he also gave his Morose a little more dignity: his Morose protests more violently against being obliged to

confess impotence and refuses to admit it in words, instead he signs reluctantly a confession of impotence dictated to him

From this comparison, it is seen that, in all essential portions of the action, Rousseau followed Jonson as closely as he thought the French rules would allow, with the exception of the detail mentioned above concerning the revelation of Dauphine's plot to the other characters. Rousseau possibly decided that the behavior of Eutrapel and the women would not be sufficiently motivated, hence not *vraisemblable*, if it were not made clear that they were consciously cooperating in Léandre's plot. The parts suppressed by the French poet were parts which, amusing in themselves, were not essential to the development of the plot and hence violated the unity of action.

As far as the character of Morose goes—in Rousseau's mind certainly the most important feature of the play—the original was reproduced carefully, with the exception of one curious point. At the end, when Epicœne's identity is revealed, Jonson's Morose exits without a word, whereas Rousseau's delivers a final tirade in which he reviles the characters who have made a game of him, but declares himself satisfied anyway, as he is certain now that he can have rest and quiet. This seems in line with the French author's apparent desire to keep the character of Morose unchanged and intact (as Molière would have done), but to allow him to maintain a certain amount of dignity.

When we consider the matter of similarities of detail in the two plays, we must remark at once that Rousseau's play, even in scenes that correspond exactly, is in no way a translation of Jonson's. It should be remembered that the English play is in prose, and the French in verse, in regular Alexandrines. Furthermore, although, as far as language went, considerably greater freedom was permitted in French comedy than in French tragedy, there is a great and fundamental difference between rich, vigorous, earthy Elizabethan prose and classical French verse, even when the latter is taken in its familiar and realistic moments. Hence, the closest Rousseau came to his English source is in making use of specific ideas or themes within scenes that correspond in function. For instance, the scene in the second act, where Truewit (Eutrapel) comes in to badger Morose with an unsolicited warning against marriage, is similar in the two plays. The following parallel passages show the use Jean Baptiste made of details found in Jonson.

## THE SILENT WOMAN

TRUEWIT

They say you are to marry, to  
marry' do you maik, sir?

MOROSE

How then, rude companion'

TRUEWIT

Marry, your friends do wonder, sir,  
the Thames being so near, wherein  
you may drown so handsomely, or  
London Bridge at a low fall, with a  
fine leap, to hurry you down stream,  
or, such a delicate steeple in the  
town, as Bow, to vault from, or, a  
braver height, as Paul's Or, if you  
affected to do it nearer home, and a  
shorter way, an excellent garret-  
window into the street, or, a beam  
in the said garret, with this halter—  
(shows him the halter)— any  
way rather than follow this goblin  
matrimony

(Act II, Scene 1)

## L'HYPONCONDRE

EUTRAPEL

Vous prétendez, dit-on, vous marier  
en forme'

Vous marier' vous, vous'

MOROSE

Ah, quelle voix énorme!

EUTRAPEL

Comme si dans Paris vous manquiez  
de secours

Pour abréger le fil de vos malheu-  
reux jours'

Que la Seine, épuisée et tarie en sa  
source,

Ne vous pût de ses flots présenter la  
ressource;

Ou que vous n'eussiez pas, si c'est  
votre plaisir,

Pour vous précipiter cent clochers  
à choisir'

Vous marier, morbleu'

(Act II, Scene 11)

From the passages quoted we see that Rousseau took from Jonson two of the suggested methods of suicide, but that he altered them, while adapting them, of course, to Paris. He simplified and shortened, of concrete local references he used only two—Paris and Seine—, as against four in Jonson—Thames, London Bridge, Bow and Paul's. Moreover, instead of using the French equivalent of the specific verb "to drown," he used a circumlocution, speaking of the Seine as a "ressource pour abréger le fil de vos malheureux jours." It should be noted that the adaptation is by no means unskillful, the passage is clear, the rhythm flows easily. Rousseau should not be condemned for making use of circumlocution, it would be incorrect to say that all circumlocutions are bad: this one is clear and presents an image. Eutrapel's speech in Rousseau's play lacks some of the racy, picturesque vigor of Truewit's in the *Silent Woman*, but it has qualities of its own that are not negligible.

In short, *L'Hypocondre* is a respectable adaptation of a very good English comedy. At the time it was written, however, and for long afterwards, Rousseau's effort was, if noticed at all, treated as



beneath contempt, a thing that had better not be mentioned and that should be forgotten as quickly as possible<sup>5</sup> Hence it passed into oblivion, an oblivion so complete that though recent English editors of Jonson's works mention the fact that a "bad French translation" of *the Silent Woman* was said to have been made in the eighteenth century,<sup>6</sup> they are unable to give further precisions

HENRY A GRUBBS

Princeton University

---

### SOME NOTES ON EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY ESSEX PLAYS

The following notes are but a supplement to Mr T M H Blair's edition of John Banks's *The Unhappy Favourite*, recently published<sup>1</sup> In his introduction, notes, and appendix Mr Blair has provided this pathetic tragedy with the explanatory apparatus deserved by a play that for well over a hundred years seldom failed to draw tears from an audience, "I mean those whose Souls were capable of so Noble a pleasure" Nevertheless, a few points may still be made in connection with eighteenth-century versions of *The Unhappy Favourite* I should like to offer these notes on the adaptations by Ralph, Jones, and Brooke, and particularly on the Larpent manuscripts of the last two

#### 1

Concerning James Ralph's *The Fall of the Earl of Essex* (1731), Mr Blair indicates those points in the last act in which it differs

<sup>5</sup> This was Voltaire's opinion, expressed in a letter of 1752, in which he was apparently trying to be fair to J B Rousseau In fact, he said that he thought the play must have been published by an enemy of Rousseau's who was endeavoring to discredit his memory (See *Œuvres de Voltaire*, ed Moland, xxxvii, 411) The only contemporary who is known to have expressed a favorable opinion of *L'Hypocondre* was Titon du Tillet (a good friend of J B Rousseau) In *La Suite du Parnasse français* (1743, p 753), speaking of Rousseau's plays, he referred to *L'Hypocondre* as "la seule qui n'est point imprimée et qui mérite fort de l'être, par la singularité des caractères des acteurs et par la beauté de la versification"

<sup>6</sup> See, for instance, *The Best Plays of Ben Jonson* (Mermaid Series), London, Unwin, n d III, 146

<sup>1</sup> John Banks, *The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex*, edited with an Introduction and Notes by Thomas Marshall Howe Blair New York Columbia University Press, 1939

most remarkably from other English and French renderings of the story, noting that "Ralph begins the scene [V, 1] by showing Elizabeth in disguise about to visit Essex in the Tower", and that, at the end of the play, "Ralph provides details which are unique and striking," having the body of Essex brought upon the stage in a coffin, by which the Countess of Rutland kneels and "Elizabeth exclaims that it is

a Sight that startles Nature, and distracts  
The Mind with Horror " 2

It may be worth observing that in these two details Ralph is in accord in the handling of the conclusion of the story with the first dramatist known to have used the material (without the ring theme), Antonio Coello, whose *El Conde de Sex* (performed 1633, printed, Barcelona, 1638) preceded La Calprenède's tragedy by five years. In Coello's *El Conde de Sex, ó Dar la Vida por su Dama* the Queen, disguised, actually visits the condemned traitor in his prison, and at the end the corpse of Essex is shown upon the stage.<sup>3</sup> Of course, Ralph might have arrived independently at these devices to heighten the effect of his last act, but it is not too rash to suggest that he may have known some version of the Spanish play or some derivative from it.<sup>4</sup>

## 2

Henry Jones's *The Earl of Essex* (1753) was the second eighteenth-century version to appear in London, and it became the favorite

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp 110, 117

<sup>3</sup> See Antonio Coello, *El Conde de Sex, ó Dar la Vida por su Dama*, *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, vol 45 "Dramáticos Contemporáneos de Lope de Vega" (ed Ramón de Mesonero Romanos, Madrid, 1858), II, 403-420, and Emilio Cotarelo, "Dramáticos del Siglo XVII Don Antonio Coello y Ochoa," *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, v (1918), 550 (I am indebted to my colleague, Professor Sturgis E Leavitt, for references to Coello) See also Winifred Smith, "The Earl of Essex on the Stage," *PMLA*, xxxix (1924), 147-173

<sup>4</sup> Winifred Smith, *op cit*, has described Italian versions derived from Coello, one, by Niccolo Biancolelli, as early as 1668, and "*commedia dell'arte* variants" Miss Smith is unable to suggest Coello's source, but she observes that "there is at least a possibility that the Spaniard, Antonio Perez, in London and intimately acquainted with Essex in 1595 . may have been the retailer of some of the facts of the tragic story" (P 149, n 4)

arrangement of the story on the eighteenth-century stage *The Dramatic Censor*, twenty years later, described the play, compared it with other versions, and advanced these conclusions

This tragedy, being founded on historical fact, and that domestic also, has particular influence upon a British audience, the plot is regular, the scenes well ranged, and the characters naturally drawn, the language is chaste, the versification harmonious and expressive, and the sentiments instructive, it is less bombastic, and more natural than Banks's, not so nervous or sentimental as Brooke's play, on the same subject, but more consonant to general apprehension and taste, it certainly does not deserve the stile of a capital performance, but, as we think, may very properly stand the test of perusal and performance<sup>5</sup>

As Mr Blair says,<sup>6</sup> "The abstract quality of much of its phraseology, together with the regularity and balance of the lines, undoubtedly made it appeal to eighteenth-century audiences", and it did indeed prove "to be the most popular of all" In this version considerable emphasis is placed upon the struggle between Burleigh and Essex, and the Queen's part is correspondingly minimized Burleigh is presented more nearly as a villain actively trying to ruin Essex than, as in Banks, merely an opportunist, profiting from Essex' mistakes Though pitched in a lower emotional key, Jones's play contains less narrative dialogue than its predecessors, events are somewhat better concatenated, and the whole is more smoothly conducted These virtues may, perhaps, be credited to the experienced player and the accomplished gentleman who aided in the composition of the play

Jones has acknowledged a debt to Colley Cibber and Lord Chesterfield, and the chaste language, harmonious and expressive versification, and instructive sentiments that led Gentleman to praise this tragedy above its rivals are not apparent in the earliest version of Jones's play that I know, that found in the Larpernt manuscript<sup>7</sup> First, it should be noted that the manuscript was sent to the Examiner of Plays for license by John Rich on February 14, 1750/51, two years before the play was produced and printed This manuscript gives a text of the play much less polished than that printed, it shows crudities of language, rough verse, and

<sup>5</sup> [Francis Gentleman,] *The Dramatic Censor* (London, 1770), II, 234-235

<sup>6</sup> *Op cit*, p. 127

<sup>7</sup> Concerning the Larpernt manuscripts see *Catalogue of the Larpernt Plays in the Huntington Library*, San Marino, California, 1939

impassioned, incoherent utterance by the characters,—all features that were eliminated before the copy was given to the printer. In some instances this version is closer to the text of Banks than the printed text, in others less close. The nature of these revisions is shown in the scene in which Rutland reveals to the Queen her marriage to Essex. The printed text is quoted by Mr Blair<sup>s</sup> to show the various handlings of this scene. In the manuscript Jones's scene is closer to Banks in ideas and feeling. Thus

Queen Husband Confusion, Ha—  
 Rutland I will not let thee go  
     The throbbing Infant pleads, the Mother begs  
     The Babe unborn beseeches in the Womb  
     To spare its Fathers precious life if e'er  
     Thy soul Shall mercy need bestow it now  
     Preserve the fruit of our encreasing Loves  
     And save my Essex life O save him, save him  
 Queen Away—Tare off her hold—  
 Rutland O Gracious Queen,  
     He ever loved—was ever Loyale Brave  
     Your Conqu'ring Essex—  
     The mortal minutes come—  
     If nature dwells about your heart—Oh spurn me not  
     My murder'd Lord, my Love—my Husband bleeds  
     Relentless Queen—the Tomb's prepar'd—my Child,  
     One Tomb shall to its cold embrace receive us—  
     O yet—for pity sake—let go your hands  
     I'll hang upon her bend her heart to Grace  
     Nay force me not—Inhuman Wretches 'Mercy  
     Oh! Mercy'

Exit Rutland forc'd off

As the passage quoted by Mr Blair shows, the throbbing infant, the rugged violence, the broken lines, and the needless alexandrine are all gone from the final version.

The lines that precede the tag of the last act further illustrate the difference. In the manuscript they are

Queen Support me providence!—ye Guardian Spirits  
     Lend me your Sacred Aid—your Charge attend  
     Sustain this dreadful Blow—Detested Woman! [Nottingham]  
     Malignant Wretch! O Injur'd hapless Essex!  
     All Gracious Heav'n, how vain is human Wisdom  
     Oppos'd to thy Unchangeable Decree

---

<sup>s</sup> *Op cit*, p 106

Whose perfect providence Iust Means Imloys  
 Beyond the weak Extent of Human sight  
 For Mystic Bounty and the Wisest Ends

As printed, the lines become

O barbarous Woman!  
 Surrounded still by Treachery and Fraud!  
 What bloody deed is this? Thou injur'd Essex!  
 My Fame is soil'd to all succeeding Times  
 But Heav'n alone can view the breaking Heart,  
 Then let its will be done —

Obviously, some one has touched up Jones's verses. Perhaps they were revised by Chesterfield and Cibber between the time that the license was granted and the appearance of the piece on the stage.

The continued use of the printed version is shown by its inclusion in 1808 in Mrs. Inchbald's edition, which reprints with only a few omissions here and there the text of Dodsley's edition of 1753. The text of the Larpent manuscript may have been used on the stage originally, but I doubt it, even though there is no evidence among the Larpent plays that the final text was submitted for license. Certainly, licensed or not, the smoother text became the standard.

3

The version of Henry Brooke's adaptation of *The Unhappy Favourite* that was used in Dublin in 1750 seems to have disappeared, but one may suspect that it differed from that published in London in 1761.<sup>9</sup> This latter is a condensed paraphrase of Banks, following the original closely until the last act.<sup>10</sup> There the farewell between the condemned Essex and the pardoned Southampton is worked up, and that between Essex and his wife is toned down. But, in a new scene that has no counterpart in the earlier versions, Lady Rutland goes quite mad. This scene replaces the reconciliation of Elizabeth and Rutland provided by Banks at this point. Despite the mad secondary heroine, however, Brooke gives the final moments to the Queen, though he stresses her personal grief rather than the inconveniences of royal station, in the concluding lines.

<sup>9</sup> With some minor changes, the 1761 text was also included in *A Collection of Pieces* by Henry Brooke, Esq. (4 vols., London, 1778).

<sup>10</sup> See Blair, *op cit*, pp. 109-110, 124-125.

Cecil, thou dost not know what thou hast done—  
 Pronounc'd sentence of death upon thy Queen  
 Cecil—I will no more ascend my throne,  
 The humble floor shall serve me, here I'll sit  
 With moaping melancholy my companion,  
 'Till death unmark'd approach, to steal me to my grave  
 Cecil—I never more will close these eyes  
 In sleep, nor taste of food—and Cecil now,  
 Mark me—You hear Elizabeth's last words

From this have been removed all questions of statecraft (such as are found in Banks) and all indications of moral lessons (so prominent in Jones), to give the stage entirely to two pathetic women, undone by the villainy of a third, who cherished an unrequited love for the hero. Lady Rutland goes mad, and Elizabeth remains in possession of her faculties only to be doomed to a few miserable days of loneliness and despair. All this, I think, shows the hand of an expert reviser, accustomed to making old plays please new audiences.

The Larpent manuscript of this adaptation was sent to the Examiner on December 31, 1760, only three days before the first performance at Drury Lane. This indicates that the manager was acting with unwonted haste, as he usually observed the legal requirement of two-weeks' notice fairly well. Furthermore, the manuscript is almost entirely in the handwriting of David Garrick himself, another unusual circumstance. Among the Larpent plays are over twenty others that Garrick was connected with as sole or part author, but none contains so large a proportion of his handwriting. This manuscript is, also, much corrected throughout, it contains numerous cancelled passages, often with substitutions written opposite on the back of the preceding page. It shows signs of much reworking and much indecision (a cancelled passage is occasionally restored to its original state after substitutions had been written). It is apparent that Garrick was himself preparing an acting version, but it is not possible to say whether he was working from Brooke's version of 1750 or from a revision of that made by Brooke. I suspect that he was using the old Dublin text, but he was not working alone. A few corrections are found in a hand that appears to be Brooke's.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> For opinions sustaining my guesses about the handwriting I am indebted to the staff of the Manuscripts Department of the Huntington Library.

The text of the manuscript differs a good deal from that of the edition of 1761, and among the passages cancelled in the manuscript and not printed are several that might have been construed in 1760 as having political significance. Since the manuscript shows no sign of censorship by the Examiner, one may assume that these passages were removed by Garrick, who would realize the danger of delay if revisions were demanded, and would know that Brooke was still remembered as the author of the objectionable *Gustavus Vasa*, which had been prohibited in 1739. The most remarkable of these lines are seen in the three examples that follow.

At the end of Act I, the following lines of Elizabeth are deleted <sup>12</sup>

No tool for faction—I will see and hear,  
Not by state organs, ear'd[?] and spectacl'd  
To your presentments, but with face to face,  
Sovereign and Subject. No, I will no more  
Of state worn manacles, and Royal bondage,  
Fretting the mind, and shutting from its eye  
The brighter day of truth

In Act III, in cancelled lines, Essex refers to courts as places

Where unacquainted virtue meets a foe  
In every face, and worth is sure dishonour <sup>13</sup>

From Cecil's account of Essex' address to the citizens urging rebellion the following lines were removed

If all should fail  
To move you, for your country, for yourselves,  
Yet for your Queen arise, She claims your rescue,  
Close prisoner kept, under mock shew of Royalty,  
By a cabal of traytors

Even before Wilkes and Junius began their attacks, ministers were sensitive to such allusions to factions, tools, the ingratitude of courts, and cabals of traitors. Brooke should have known this, and Garrick certainly had no notion of espousing Brooke's liberal politics or of flying in the face of the Examiner of plays <sup>14</sup>

The handwriting and alterations, of course, show that Garrick had a considerable part in Brooke's adaptation of Banks as it

<sup>12</sup> Banks's lines at this point are quite different

<sup>13</sup> Banks's Essex (1682 edition, p. 42) expresses a similar notion less explicitly and at greater length

<sup>14</sup> Edward Capell, Deputy Examiner, was the active official at this time

appeared at this time. It is likely that Garrick was responsible for removing objectionable lines. Finally, the alterations in the last act, at those points where this version differs from the others, especially in the introduction of a mad heroine and the exaggeration of the pathos, are quite characteristic of the Garrick method of adaptation, as it may be seen, for instance, in his *Romeo and Juliet*. Brooke's *The Earl of Essex*, therefore, appears to be another of those adaptations in which Garrick had so large a share that he should be regarded as a collaborator.

DOUGALD MACMILLAN

*The University of North Carolina*

#### MILTON AND EDWARD ECCLESTONE'S *NOAH'S FLOOD*

The appearance of the Miltonic tradition in the English theatre since the time of the poet has been so thoroughly studied<sup>1</sup> as to render it improbable that any significant contribution to the subject will be forthcoming. There remains, however, an interesting connection between *Paradise Lost* and a little-known Restoration opera. I refer to Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood, or The Destruction of the World*,<sup>2</sup> which appeared in 1679, only two years after the publication of Dryden's rhymed operatic version of Milton's epic. I shall summarize here the action and the few other known facts concerning Ecclestone's piece.

If Dryden's *The State of Innocence* was excluded from the theatre because, in Dr Johnson's words, "it cannot be decently represented upon the stage,"<sup>3</sup> this later opera of Ecclestone in failing to appear can claim not even the excuse of impropriety of costume. It would be difficult to find more absurd theatrical entertainment than *Noah's Flood*, here we have the scraps of the worst Restoration "operatic" practices.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. D. Havens (*The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*, Cambridge, 1922) and Alwin Thaler ("Milton in the Theatre," in *Shakspeare's Silences*, Cambridge, 1929).

<sup>2</sup> I have used the copies in the Library of Congress and in the Harvard University Library, both of which are of the same edition. *Noah's Flood, or, the Destruction of the World*, dedicated to Her Grace the Dutchesse of Monmouth, by Edward Ecclestone, Gent. London. Printed by M. Clark, and sold by B. Tooke at the Ship in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1679.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by D. E. Baker, *Biographia Dramatica* (London, 1782), II, 385.



Ecclestone discards the theme of the fall in Eden, which Dryden follows in *The State of Innocence*, and substitutes for it a warring of Lucifer and the powers of Hell upon Noah and his family. Act I opens with a scene in Hell in which Lucifer, Asmodey, Belial, and Satan discuss the coming flood on Earth and rejoice that mankind is about to perish. Lucifer determines to destroy the ark bearing Noah and the animals. He dispatches Belial to look about and to find a means of bringing ruin upon Noah. Belial returns and announces his intention of disguising himself as a beast and entering the ark, there to breed sin and discord. Lucifer and his cohorts, meanwhile, will hover about the ark outside and brew fierce storms to wreck it.

In Act II the angel Gabriel comes to Noah to warn him of the approaching flood. Noah is instructed to build and to prepare the ark into which he is to take his family and the animals. Gabriel departs, and the scene shifts to Hell, where Lucifer and his company continue their plans to plague Noah.

Sacrifices are offered to Heaven by the sons of Noah at the opening of the third act. Noah enters and is accosted by Lucifer disguised as an angel. He is told that the flood will not occur. Suddenly Gabriel appears and reveals the true character of Lucifer. Moloch (*not* Belial) is found in the shape of a beast and is warned to stay away from the ark. In an ensuing scene in Hell the devils plan open warfare upon Noah and his company. Meanwhile the flood waters begin to rise.

Act IV opens with a spectacular scene in which Lucifer and his cohorts assault the ark. The protection of Heaven remains over Noah, however, and the devils retreat to Pandemonium for a council. Here Sin and Death enter and offer to tempt Noah to destruction by the lure of the flesh. Lucifer accepts the plan, and the evil beings betake themselves to Earth. A final scene represents Noah's thanksgiving as the flood waters begin to withdraw.

In the closing act Noah and his sons become drunk with wine which they have distilled from a "poisonous berry" called the grape. In a stupor Noah dreams of the future and sees his family cursed with adversity for their sins. An angel appears from Heaven and announces that the people of Earth must scatter abroad and populate all regions and climes. As countless multitudes are dispersed to the several parts of Earth from the burning Tower of Babel, the opera closes.

The text of the piece is amply prefaced by Ecclestone's own "Epistle to the Reader" and by congratulatory rhymes from friends. In the minds of these authors there seems to have been some confusion regarding the exact nature of Ecclestone's debt to Dryden and, more specifically, to the original model of Milton. One Richard Saunders writes

We see an active soul in every line,  
And every word is like thy Theme, *Divine*  
*Dryden* will grieve to hear thy Couplets Chime  
And yield he's foy'd at his own Weapon, Rhime

Another friend, John Leanerd, praises the work in this wise

*Milton* reviv'd, or rather *Dryden* trac'd  
Each step found out and follow'd, though in haste,  
A second *Op'ra* to the World is brought,  
Full of quick sence, smooth fancy, subtle thought

To what extent he has revived Milton the dramatist does not tell us. He seeks only to excuse himself for his mixture of sacred and profane subjects.

As for the Nature of the Poem, which is Holy, though intermixt with Spirits, yet I have not herein trod in an unknown path, but shall procure Authority for what I do. *Mr Dreydon's State of Innocency and Fall of Man*, is of the same Nature with this, from whose incomparable Piece I drew this rugged draught, and Milton's *Paradise Lost* is full of the same Adornments [spirits?]

He has forgotten that Milton furnishes, through Dryden, more than the "adornments" of his play. Actually, there is little of Dryden's work in the piece. The points of similarity between the two operas are few in number. There are the opening scenes in Hell and the expression of Lucifer's determination for revenge, the appearance of angels sent from Heaven to warn Man of approaching danger, and the disguise of Lucifer for the purpose of hastening the fall of Man. But Ecclestone's dependency upon Dryden ends here, and it would seem that he turned to the original for that with which his imagination did not supply him.

Particularly convincing are two appearances of the Sin and Death motif which indicate immediately the familiarity of the author with *Paradise Lost*. Since Dryden makes no use of these characters in *The State of Innocence*, Ecclestone must have gone to Milton for them. In Act IV of the opera, while the ark is being

besieged by Lucifer from without, a masque-like interlude takes place

Enter Sin and Death, Sin appearing upward like a fair Beautiful Woman, but ending in a Serpentine Scaley Tail,<sup>4</sup> Death wearing a Crown of Gold upon his Head<sup>5</sup>

Sin and Death talk of the latter's triumph over the dead. Sin recounts the conception of Death and explains his origin through her union with Satan<sup>6</sup> The two plan that Sin shall lure Man to his downfall Again, in Act V, a second scene takes place in which these two figures reappear After Noah has become drunk

a sumptuous Banquet of all sorts of Fruits, especially of Grapes, rises up out of the Earth Sin enters in a rich, gaudy loose Attire, and after her several Devils in the shapes of men and women who make their obeysance to her Death rises with a Dart in his hand,<sup>7</sup> moving it, by turns at everyone of them They all draw and fight and mortally wound each other

It is obvious that Ecclestone's figures are turned to his own purposes, but they are unquestionably Miltonic in origin

There is, however, the probability that the prefaces to the work, in particular that of the author, have deliberately minimized the nature of the dramatist's debt to Milton A complete disregard of the great original must certainly have been unreasonable before readers who were acquainted, however slightly or indifferently, with those verses which Dryden had "tagged" in *The State of Innocence* Yet Ecclestone exercised considerable care in directing his chief acknowledgment to that poet who enjoyed a reputation happily unclouded by any previous allegiance to the Commonwealth and who, by virtue of his popularity as a dramatist, might, in some measure, carry a new play by a little known author in the wake of his triumphs Much less felicitous would have been an acknowledgment of indebtedness to the Latin Secretary under Cromwell, Ecclestone did not choose to emphasize it If Dryden's opera was handicapped by its relation to Milton,<sup>8</sup> upon whom the restored

<sup>4</sup> Cf *Paradise Lost*, II, 724

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, II, 765 6

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, II, 673

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, II, 672

<sup>8</sup> The similarity of the opera to *Paradise Lost* may have determined its failure to attain performance inasmuch as Milton was suspect as a Puritan at the time Cf Alwin Thaler, "Milton in the Theatre," *SP*, XVII (1920), 281 Several years after its appearance, in 1712, a play modeled upon the opera was produced in a London puppet show, a performance which, accord-

monarchy could look scarcely with favor, so may *Noah's Flood* have failed to gain the favor which its author sought. No one in any degree familiar with Milton's epic could have failed to notice the nature of Ecclestone's borrowings.

*Noah's Flood*, apart from its failure to arrive on the stage, was unsuccessful with the reading public. Twelve years after it appeared Gerard Langbaine wrote of the piece:

This play not going off, a new Title and Cuts were affix'd to it in Hillary Term, 1684, it then going under the Title of *The Cataclism, or General Deluge of the World*.<sup>9</sup>

J. R. BAIRD

*New Haven, Connecticut*

## WORDSWORTH AND THE PATHETIC FALLACY

The parallels between Ruskin's theory of the pathetic fallacy and certain of Wordsworth's observations on poetic diction and style are sufficiently close to suggest that the essentials of Ruskin's famous essay had already been enunciated by the poet. We know that Ruskin was familiar with Wordsworth's critical essays, since three times in his works he makes a passing reference to them and since in "Fiction, Fair and Foul" he says "I happen myself to have used Wordsworth as a daily text-book from youth to age, and have lived, moreover, in all essential points according to the tenor of his teaching"<sup>1</sup>.

The relation between Wordsworth's critical theories and Ruskin's "On the Pathetic Fallacy" may be thus summarized: (1) Both were advocates of naturalism, insisting that the best style is based on seeing clearly and describing accurately what is seen. (2) Wordsworth as well as Ruskin deprecates an untrue presentation of "real objects" due to false or misguided sentiment, and he cites some instances of what Ruskin later called the pathetic fallacy. (3) But Wordsworth avoids forming a system, and actually advocates the

ing to Professor Havens, may have been suggested by the *Spectator Papers* on Milton. Cf. R. D. Havens, "An Adaptation of One of Dryden's Plays," *RES*, IV (1928), 88.

<sup>9</sup> *An Account of the English Dramatic Poets* (Oxford, 1691), p. 186.

<sup>1</sup> *Works of Ruskin*, "Library Edition," IV, 229-230, 299, XII, 354, XXXIV, 349.

pathetic fallacy when it is the product of the imagination and the fancy

(1) The foundation of Ruskin's essay is his insistence on naturalism and truth in literature as in art. This attitude is best affirmed elsewhere in *Modern Painters*: "the more I think of it I find this conclusion more impressed upon me,—that the greatest thing a human soul ever does in this world is to *see* something, and tell what it *saw* in a plain way"<sup>2</sup>. We are reminded of Wordsworth's statement

I do not know how to give my Reader a more exact notion of the style in which it was my wish and intention to write, than by informing him that I have at all times endeavoured to look steadily at my subject, consequently, there is I hope in these Poems little falsehood of description, and my ideas are expressed in language fitted to their respective importance<sup>3</sup>.

Here Wordsworth says he saw truthfully, and told what he saw "in a plain way," to use Ruskin's phrase. Again he remarks that, with certain exceptions, the poetry from Milton to Thomson "does not contain a single new image of external Nature, and scarcely presents a familiar one from which it can be inferred that the eye of the Poet had been steadily fixed upon his object"<sup>4</sup>. Turning to Ruskin's "Essay" we find this echo of Wordsworth's final phrase

but it is only the basest writer who cannot speak of the sea without talking of 'raging waves,' 'remorseless floods,' 'ravenous billows,' etc., and it is one of the signs of the highest power in a writer to check all such habits of thought, and to keep his eyes fixed firmly on the *pure fact*<sup>5</sup>.

Thus far we may say that Ruskin is, consciously or unconsciously, repeating Wordsworth.

(2) Did Wordsworth distinguish the peculiar type of observation of things that Ruskin terms the pathetic fallacy, that is, a false perception of things due to strong feeling? This is certainly implied in the above quotations. But Wordsworth admits that passion may color the language of a poet.

The earliest poets of all nations generally wrote from passion excited by real events, they wrote naturally, and as men feeling powerfully as they

<sup>2</sup> *Op cit*, v, 333

<sup>3</sup> Preface to *Lyrical Ballads*, 1800, *Prose Works*, ed Grosart, II, 84

<sup>4</sup> "Essay Supplementary to the Preface," Grosart, II, 118

<sup>5</sup> *Op cit*, v, 211

did, their language was daring, and figurative. In succeeding times, Poets, and Men ambitious of the fame of Poets, perceiving the influence of such language, and desirous of producing the same effect without being animated by the same passion, set themselves to a mechanical adoption of these figures of speech, and made use of them, sometimes with propriety, but much more frequently applied them to feelings and thoughts with which they had no natural connection whatsoever.<sup>6</sup>

Ruskin elaborates these points in describing his fourth class of poets

A poet is great, first in proportion to the strength of his passion, and then, that strength being granted, in proportion to his government of it, there being, however, always a point beyond which it would be inhuman and monstrous if he pushed this government, and, therefore, a point at which all feverish and wild fancy becomes just and true. Thus the destruction of the kingdom of Assyria cannot be contemplated firmly by a prophet of Israel. The fact is too great, too wonderful. It overthrows him, dashes him into a confused element of dreams. All the world is, to his stunned thought, full of strange voices. 'Yea, the fir trees rejoice at thee, and the cedars of Lebanon, saying, "Since thou art gone down to the grave, no feller is come up against us".'

But by how much this feeling is noble when it is justified by the strength of its cause, by so much it is ignoble when there is not cause enough for it, and beyond all other ignobleness is the mere affectation of it, in hardness of heart. Simply bad writing may almost always be known by its adoption of these fanciful metaphorical expressions as a sort of current coin, yet there is even a worse, in which such expressions are not ignorantly and feelinglessly caught up, but, by some master, skilful in handling, yet insincere, deliberately wrought out with chill and studied fancy.<sup>7</sup>

Ruskin then quotes Pope in illustration, one of the school of writers whom Wordsworth was attacking.<sup>1</sup>

Wordsworth himself points out as false style the very use of the pathetic fallacy that Ruskin attributes to second-class poets. Further on in his note on poetic diction, he quotes the following lines from Cowper

But the sound of the church going bell  
These valleys and rocks never heard,  
Ne'er sigh'd at the sound of a knell,  
Or smiled when a Sabbath appeared

After commenting sharply on "church-going" as applied to a bell, he says

<sup>6</sup> "Of Poetic Diction," Grosart, II, 101

<sup>7</sup> *Op cit*, v, 215-216

The two lines 'Ne'er sigh'd at the sound,' &c, are, in my opinion, an instance of the language of passion wrested from its proper use, and applied upon an occasion that does not justify such violent expressions<sup>8</sup>

(3) While there is much agreement between Wordsworth's attitude and many aspects of Ruskin's "Essay," Wordsworth never formulates a theory of the pathetic fallacy. The greatest poets, says Ruskin, perceive rightly, in spite of their feelings

Therefore the high creative poet might even be thought, to a great extent, impassive (as shallow people think Dante stern), receiving indeed all feelings to the full, but having a great centre of reflection and knowledge in which he stands serene, and watches the feeling, as it were, from afar off<sup>9</sup>

We are reminded at once of Wordsworth's "emotions recollected in tranquillity." But Wordsworth's conception of the great poet is not determined by such an application of the niceties of the pathetic fallacy as Ruskin makes. On the contrary, Wordsworth regards a genuine use of the pathetic fallacy as one of the products of man's highest creative faculty, the imagination and its humbler sister fancy. The habit of accurate observation and description, unaffected by the passions, is but the first step. The result of this observation ultimately passes through the alembic of the imagination, and the final product should be something new, something more than a reproduction of nature.

Two quotations, which Wordsworth gives in the 1815 Preface, illustrate what he means by imagination in the forming of poetic images or pictures.

In the first Eclogue of Virgil, the shepherd, thinking of the time when he is to take leave of his farm, thus addresses his goats —

Non ego vos posthac viridi projectus in antro  
Dumosa *pendere* procul de rupe videbo  
half way down

*Hangs* one who gathers samphire,

is the well known expression of Shakspeare, delineating an ordinary image upon the cliffs of Dover. In these two instances is a slight exertion of the faculty which I denominate imagination, in the use of one word neither the goats nor the samphire gatherer do literally hang but, presenting to the senses something of such an appearance, the mind in its activity, for its own gratification, contemplates them as hanging<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Grosart, II, 104

<sup>9</sup> *Op cit*, v, 210

<sup>10</sup> Grosart, II, 136

Finally, Wordsworth quotes two instances of the pathetic fallacy, both of which he approves as products of the creative faculty, the first being an instance of mere fancy, while the second is the product of imagination

I will content myself with placing a conceit (ascribed to Lord Chesterfield) in contrast with a passage from the 'Paradise Lost' —

The dews of the evening most carefully shun,  
They are the tears of the sky for the loss of the sun

After the transgression of Adam, Milton, with other appearances of sympathising Nature, thus marks the immediate consequence,

Sky lowered, and muttering thunder, some sad drops  
Wept at completion of the mortal sin

The associating link is the same in each instance. Dew and rain, not distinguishable from the liquid substance of tears, are employed as indications of sorrow. A flash of surprise is the effect in the former case, a flash of surprise, and nothing more, for the nature of things does not sustain the combination. In the latter, the effects from the act, of which there is this immediate consequence and visible sign, are so momentous, that the mind acknowledges the justice and reasonableness of the sympathy in nature so manifested, and the sky weeps drops of water as if with human eyes.<sup>11</sup>

Evidently Wordsworth would not deny poets of the "first rank" the use of the pathetic fallacy. On the contrary, he regards this species of figurative language as the product of the creative mind, if the feeling which engendered it is true, and if its ultimate origin is an accurate observation of "things as they are in themselves."

On the whole it would appear that Wordsworth anticipated the best things of Ruskin's famous essay

JAMES V. LOGAN

*The Ohio State University*

## A NOTE ON CHARLES HOPKINS (c. 1671-1700)

Among the lesser figures in the age of Dryden, Charles Hopkins, friend of both Dryden and Congreve, has been somewhat neglected. His reputation for amiability and good fellowship, well supported by the testimony of his more famous friends, and the merit of his best poems, a number of light love lyrics, give him a just claim to

<sup>11</sup> Grosart, II, 142



notice So pleasing is the impression of gaiety and charm derived from even a casual reading of his best verses, that we would gladly know more of this persuasive Irishman—Irish by early training and education at least, and possibly by birth On a few points the present note seeks to shed some light

On the date and place of his birth the *DNB* seems to have adopted the less likely alternative Charles was the son of Bishop Ezekiel Hopkins by his first wife so much is clear, but when he was born, and where, remain uncertain The *DNB* gives the birth date as "1664?" and the city as Exeter Writers who support this view, with more or less authority, are Giles Jacob,<sup>1</sup> Alexander Chalmers,<sup>2</sup> Thomas Fuller's successor,<sup>3</sup> and William B S Taylor<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, John Prince,<sup>5</sup> who is supposed to have known Charles's father and who, therefore, might have told us with certainty, mentions the poet only in passing

On the other hand, we have two educational records which indicate that Charles was born in 1671 at Dublin These are records of matriculation at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1685, *aged 14*,<sup>6</sup> and at Queens' College, Cambridge, in 1687<sup>7</sup> The latter record repeats the information given in the former about the boy's age, and was probably copied from it Now, the Trinity College record appears to carry more weight than the undocumented essays of early biographers, and, indeed, a youth was more likely to enter the university at the age of 14 than 21 Moreover, the later date agrees better with what we know of his father's movements, which are fairly clear.

Although Ezekiel Hopkins was apparently married to his first wife some time in the early 'sixties, he did not leave London for Exeter until 1666<sup>8</sup> It is difficult to see how the poet could have

<sup>1</sup> *Poetical Register*, London, 1723, I, 75

<sup>2</sup> *The General Biographical Dictionary*, new edition, London, 1814, XVIII, 157

<sup>3</sup> *History of the Worthies of England*, ed P A Nuttall, London, 1840, I, 449

<sup>4</sup> *History of the University of Dublin*, London, 1845, p 411

<sup>5</sup> *Danmonii Orientales, or, the Worthies of Devon*, Exeter, 1701

<sup>6</sup> G D Burtchaell and T U Sadleir, *Alumni Dublinenses 1593-1860*, new ed., Dublin, 1935, p 410

<sup>7</sup> John A and John Venn, *Alumni Cantabrigienses from the earliest times to 1900*, Cambridge, 1922-27, pt I, vol II, 405

<sup>8</sup> Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxoniensis 1500-1714*, vols I and II, Early Series, Oxford, 1891, p 743

been born in either Exeter or Dublin in 1664. In 1671, on the other hand, Charles's father had just been made Bishop of Raphoe,<sup>9</sup> county Donegal, Ireland. Charles Hopkins could, therefore, have been born in Ireland, even in Dublin, as has been suggested. If we accept the later date, Exeter might still have been his birthplace, since Prince notes that Ezekiel made an extended visit to Exeter some time while he was Bishop of Raphoe—namely, between 1671 and 1681, although it is unlikely that he would have absented himself from his new charge immediately. On the whole it seems best to trust the matriculation records, and put his birth tentatively at Dublin in 1671.

The identity of the poet's mother is also somewhat obscure. There is a record of the Bishop's second marriage, but not of his first. The first Mrs. Hopkins was, says the *DNB* (following Prince) a niece of Sir Robert Vyner (or Vyner), sometime Mayor of London. However, the rather full history of the Vyner family<sup>10</sup> shows that Sir Robert's nieces all made other marriages, or can be otherwise accounted for. There is another possibility. Sir Thomas Vyner, goldsmith (1588-1665), and, incidentally, uncle of Sir Robert, left Ezekiel Hopkins ten pounds in his will, dated March 16, 1664. Thus Sir Thomas had several nieces, and in some cases marriages for them are not recorded. Possibly Prince confused the two, and Ezekiel married one of Sir Thomas's nieces.<sup>11</sup>

A third question involves the poet's religion. The *DNB* in its account of Ezekiel Hopkins states that the Protestant bishop was much grieved by the apostasy of Charles, who aided the Roman Catholics in the Irish uprising of 1688. Apparently the editors have taken this view from Prince, who says that the Bishop did not live long after his flight from Ireland, being "much broken by the publick as well as his own private calamities, (that being none of the least of them, that his son had entered himself of the Roman Catholick army in Ireland)." <sup>12</sup> It should be noted that Prince

<sup>9</sup> Henry Cotton, *Fasts ecclesiae hibernicae*, Dublin, 1848-60, II, 171-2.

<sup>10</sup> Charles and Henry Vyner, *Vyner: A Family History*, 1885.

<sup>11</sup> Sir Thomas Vyner had ten brothers and sisters, seven of them by his father's previous marriage. Of Sir Thomas's many nieces, the most likely wife for Ezekiel Hopkins—if she was not too old—seems to be either Alice or Sara Moore. Both were daughters of Mary Vyner (b. 1575) and Samuel Moore, a goldsmith of London. No marriage is recorded for either of them.

<sup>12</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 517.

does not say "his son *Charles*"—it may have been one of the other shadowy children of the shadowy first wife. Moreover, Nichols, in whose *Miscellany* many of Charles Hopkins's poems are printed, says that he "exerted his early valour in the cause of his country, religion, and liberty,"<sup>13</sup> i. e., presumably in the cause of the Protestant succession. It seems more likely that Nichols is right, judging by the fact that Charles later came to England under William and settled there apparently quite happily. Furthermore, his *Whitehall, or the Court of England* (also known as *The Court Prospect*) praises extravagantly William of Orange as "Restorer of the Christian World" and flatters all his court.

Finally, the *DNB* is also uncertain about the date of Charles Hopkins's death. This can now be fixed. The poet's dedication of his play *Friendship Improv'd*, dated from Londonderry, November 1, 1699, refers to his failing health, and the parish register of Derry Cathedral<sup>14</sup> reveals that he died in the parish of Templemore, Londonderry, and was buried on March 7, 1700. His will was probated in that year,<sup>15</sup> but was lost in the destruction at the Four Courts, Dublin, in 1922.<sup>16</sup>

ALICE E. JONES

*Philadelphia*

---

### THE DATING OF YOUNG'S *NIGHT-THOUGHTS*

It has been customary to accept the year 1745 as the terminal date of the serial publication of Young's *Night-Thoughts*, the first part of which was published in the summer of 1742.<sup>1</sup> The source

<sup>13</sup> J. Nichols, *A Select Collection of Poems*, London, 1780, II, 183.

<sup>14</sup> *Register of Derry Cathedral, St. Columb's, Parish of Templemore, Londonderry, 1642-1703*, Parish Register Society, Dublin, VIII (1910), 354.

<sup>15</sup> W. P. W. Phillimore et al., *Indexes to Irish Wills*, Irish Record Series, London, 1920, vol. 5 (*Derry and Raphoe*) edited by Gertrude Thrift.

<sup>16</sup> Memorandum from the Deputy Keeper, January 22, 1938.

<sup>1</sup> Entries in the Stationers' Register of the first eight parts have been published in W. Thomas's *Le poète Edward Young* (Paris, 1901, pp. 349-352), further evidence of dating of "Nights" I-VI and VIII has been presented in two notes in *RÉS* for 1928 (R. W. C[hapman], "Young's 'Night Thoughts'," IV, 330 and George Sherburn, "Edward Young and Book Advertising," IV, 414-417). Summary of this evidence appears in the abstract of my unpublished dissertation (*Cornell University Abstracts of Theses*, Ithaca, N. Y., 1939, p. 43).

of the date 1745 is the quarto first edition of "The Consolation," the ninth and last of the *Night-Thoughts*. Here the date "1745" appears in the publisher's imprint at the foot of the title-page, and the date "October 1745" at the end of the appended "Thoughts occasioned by the Present Juncture." Heretofore unnoticed, however, is the combined evidence of periodical advertising and of the Stationers' Register alike, both sources pointing to the earliest appearance of "The Consolation" during the last week of January 1746. It is first listed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* among books published in January 1746 as well as in the following newspapers for 1746: *True Patriot*, 28 January, *General Evening Post*, 30 January, *Old England*, 1 February, *London Evening Post*, 8 February. Through the generous courtesy of the present clerk of Stationers' Hall, the entry in the Stationers' Register has been located under date of 21 January 1745 [New Style 1746], when "The Consolation To which are annexed some thoughts occasioned by the Present Juncture . . ." was registered for the publisher George Hawkins and the usual nine copies deposited.

Beloit College

HENRY PETTIT

## REVISION IN BROWNING'S *PARACELSUS*

Browning's *Paracelsus*, as we have it, is not altogether the work of a youthful poet. It was revised four times, and of the 4151 lines in the 1888 version, published the year before his death, only 1477 lines are identical with those in the first edition of 1835. The revisions can be grouped under three general headings: mechanical changes (punctuation, capitalization, spelling, etc.), expansion or condensation of thought, and stylistic changes.

The mechanical revisions have usually been regarded as "minor" and unimportant, but one occasionally meets a significant alteration such as in lines 178-180 in Scene III.<sup>1</sup>

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| 1835 | So make me smile, if the exulting look<br>You wore but now be smiling 'Tis so long<br>Since I have smiled'   |
| 1888 | So, make me smile! If the exulting look<br>You wore but now be smiling, 'tis so long<br>Since I have smiled' |

<sup>1</sup> The line numbers throughout are those of the 1888 edition.

The condensed passages (altogether ninety-four lines were omitted at one time or another) do not materially change the thought development, but merely express the original thought in fewer words. The expanded passages (149 lines were added) in general add color, but specifically strengthen the arguments of Festus and show an increased interest in the characterization of Aprile. Twelve separate passages have been added which expand the characterization of this "strange competitor" of Paracelsus. Sometimes they are brief allusions in a speech of Paracelsus, such as

IV, 225 Aprile was a poet, I make songs—

V, 854 I saw Aprile—my Aprile there'

But there are also longer passages, like the eleven lines added after line 407 in Scene II

They spread contagion, doubtless yet he seemed  
To echo one foreboding of my heart  
So truly, that no matter! How he stands  
With eve's last sunbeam staying on his hair  
Which turns to it as if they were akin  
And those clear smiling eyes of saddest blue  
Nearly set free, so far they rise above  
The painful fruitless striving of the blow  
And enforced knowledge of the lips, firm-set  
In slow despondency's eternal sigh!  
Has he, too, missed life's end, and learned the cause?

The great bulk of revisions in the poem are stylistic, changes in phraseology and word order. The number of feminine endings is reduced, rhythms are made smoother, internal rime is discarded, graphic words are added, obscure passages are here and there clarified. The revised *Paracelsus* is certainly a more graceful composition than the original, although the refinement of style necessarily results in a loss of rugged strength. Sometimes dramatic intensity is sacrificed for balance as in Scene I, which in the original version ended with the lines

*Para* Are there not Festus, are there not dear Michal  
Two points in the adventure of the diver  
One—when a beggar he prepares to plunge?  
One—when a prince he rises with his pearl?  
Festus, I plunge

The 1849 edition adds

*Fest* We wait you when you rise

Chiefly, however, the 1849 revisions make for an uncharacteristic smoothness of style or the elimination of feminine lines, as a few examples chosen at random will illustrate

- |          |      |   |
|----------|------|---|
| I, 188   | 1835 | Is in a life as though no God there were        |
|          | 1849 | In living just as though there were no God      |
| II, 103  | 1835 | If he be priest henceforth, if he wake up       |
|          | 1849 | If he be priest henceforth, or if he wake       |
| II, 156  | 1835 | To its existence life, death, light, and shadow |
|          | 1849 | To its existence life, death, light and shade   |
| III, 313 | 1835 | For the manner—'tis ungracious, probably        |
|          | 1849 | The manner is ungracious, probably              |
| V, 418   | 1835 | Thus the Mayne glideth                          |
|          | 1849 | Softly the Mayne river glideth                  |
| V, 479   | 1835 | The gulf rolls like a meadow-swell, o'erstrewn  |
|          | 1849 | The gulf rolls like a meadow, overstrewn        |
| V, 529   | 1835 | He looked for confirmation and approval         |
|          | 1849 | He looked for confirmation and applause         |

If the influence of Elizabeth Barrett Browning is responsible for any of these stylistic changes in the 1849 revision—as seems quite possible<sup>2</sup>—there may be a double significance in the reverting of 442 lines, including all but one of those quoted above,<sup>3</sup> to their original form in the three subsequent revisions, the first of which appeared in 1863, two years after the death of Browning's critic-wife

*The Ohio State University*

BERNICE FOX

## A NOTE ON R L S.

Autobiographical material from Stevenson's *Geometry Notebook* has appeared in print only twice up to the present time,<sup>1</sup> and on neither occasion has any reference been made to the most significant

<sup>2</sup> The revisions in this poem are nowhere mentioned by her, but we do know that she was suggesting revisions for other poems at this time, and the analogous nature of those revisions we know from Sir Frederick Kenyon's list of them published in his *New Poems by Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett Browning* (London, 1914), and from the article by E Snyder and F Palmer, Jr, "New Light on the Brownings," *Quarterly Review*, July, 1937

<sup>3</sup> The last half of I, 188, reverted, but Festus' comment at the end of Scene I was allowed to remain

<sup>1</sup> Christopher Morley, *Saturday Review of Literature*, March 19, 1927, Edward D Snyder, *ibid*, August 3, 1935

verses in this informal but revealing volume, which is now in the possession of Haverford College. Of the important material hitherto unpublished, one early poem, printed below, seems of special significance for its mood of deep pessimism. Had these verses appeared but once in the *Notebook*, they might be dismissed as the artificial and insignificant gesture of a youth momentarily given to sophomoric cynicism, but since the eight most crucial lines appear three times, and in different parts of the *Notebook*,<sup>2</sup> and since several of the other lines appear twice, the poem claims our attention as presumably voicing the actual, recurring mood of the youthful Stevenson during those dark Edinburgh years of which his biographers have written so sparingly.

In these verses from the *Geometry Notebook*, now printed for the first time, R. L. S. seems to have given up hope of any satisfactory intercourse with his fellows; he recognizes the value of sociability and portrays it in mellow terms, yet he seems to regard himself as a being outside the pale, as a wanderer on the face of the earth, perhaps a complete outcast. While he is outside, "in the rain and mire," he sees the cheerful fire "glint behind the curtain." But he does not have any hope of sharing in the "pleasant household laughter." Here are his poignant verses —

On this dreary shore  
Where hearts are broken daily,  
I shall sing no more  
Pleasantly and gaily

All my hopes are broken—  
All my glad words spoken—  
I shall sing no more  
Pleasantly and gaily

Warmly by the hearth  
At e'en to rest is pleasant,  
Quiet household mirth  
Pleases Lord and peasant  
All these joys are over

Often I may hear  
The pleasant household laughter;  
Shake with goodly cheer  
Homely board and rafter,  
In the rain and mire  
Belated and uncertain,  
Often see the fire  
Glint behind the curtain

[Alternative Ending]

Warmly by the hearth  
To rest at e'en is pleasant,  
Quiet household mirth  
Pleases Lord and peasant—

Only that—and then  
I go hence and know  
that [Desunt cetera]

*Haverford College*

EDWARD D. SNYDER

<sup>2</sup> The first eight lines are found on pp. 8, 9, 27

# THE DATES OF SOME OF ROBERT BRIDGES' LYRICS

At my request Mrs Robert Bridges very kindly looked through her husband's papers for material which might aid in the dating of his lyric poems. She found a loose-leaf notebook containing fifty-eight poems in manuscript, and allowed me to transcribe the dates affixed to them by their author. The years in which twelve of these poems were written may be found in the Oxford Standard Authors edition of Bridges' Poems (1936), the dates of the other forty-six are given below

<i>First words</i>	<i>MS date</i>	<i>First words</i>	<i>MS date</i>
All-ador'd	1910	No country know I	1917
As our car	1921, corrected 1925	O Love, I complain	1896
At dead of unseen	1902	On a mournful day	1916
Beneath the wattled	1895	One grief of thine	1900
Crown Winter	1889	Over the warring	1916
Folk alien	1914, dated 1904 in printed text	Power eternal	Finished May 16, 1898
From a friend's	1921	Riding adown	1899
How should I be	1921	See, Love, a year	1902
How well my eyes	1899	Since I believe	1912
I climb the mossy	Dec, 1895	Sweet pretty	Feb, 1913
I have lain	1911 or 1912	The day begins	Jan, 1894
I have sown	1899	The saddest place	1899
In still midsummer	1910, one word corrected, 1919	The sea keeps not	1899
It's all up	1902, corrected 1920	These grey stones	1902-3
Joy, sweetest lifeborn	1879	To my love	1895
Look down the river	1897	'Twas mid of the moon	1921
Love on my heart	Feb, 1890	Two demons thrust	1913
Lo where the virgin	1904	Voyaging northwards	1899
Man hath with man	1899	What happy bonds	1902
Mazing around	April, 1913	What voice	Jan, 1892
Mortal though I	"1905 or earlier"	When to my lone	1902
My delight and thy	Aug and Nov, 1896	Who goes there?	Feb, 1913
		Why hast thou nothing	1899
		Would that you were	1902, corrected 1920

Mrs. Bridges also allowed me to transcribe from her husband's copy of the 1873 *Poems* the dates which he had entered in pencil. This is Robert Bridges' earliest volume, and only seventeen of its fifty-three poems were reprinted in later volumes. Bridges' memory,



like that of so many poets, was not infallible N C Smith writes "Of his first volume, published in 1873, he himself wrote that he 'went to the seaside (Seaford) for two weeks and wrote it there'"<sup>1</sup> The book itself contains an "Advertisement" saying "The foregoing poems, with the exception of a few that have their proper dates affixed, were written between the summers of seventy-two and seventy-three"<sup>2</sup> The dates of only four of the poems (here enclosed by parentheses) were printed in the 1873 *Poems*

A boy and a girl#	Sept, 1872	Love is up#	1862, corrected 1873
A lady sat high#	Aug, 1872	Love, that is king#	1873
All women born	Aug, 1873	Night by night#	Seaford, 1873
An Abbot once lived#	Sept, 1872, Seaford	Oh how have I of- fended?#	March, 1873
An idle June#	July, 1873	Old Thunder is dead#	(1869)
A poor old#	Sept, 1872	O trust the eyes#	Aug, 1872
A poppy grows	June, 1872	Parted so long#	Feb, 1873
As in our harbour#	1872	Poor withered rose	July, 1872
Assemble, all ye	Aug, 1873	Shame on his name#	Sept, 1872
Clear and gentle	Aug, 1873	She is coming#	Not dated
Come gentle Death#	1873	Sick of my#	1865, rewritten 1873
Dear Lady, when thou	Feb, 1873	Since thou dost bid#	July, 1872
Deep in the inner#	Feb, 1873	Sometimes when	Aug, 1872
For too much love#	July, 1873	The cliff top	June, 1872
Happy the man#	(1868)	The humble bee#	1872
Her eye saw#	July, 1872	The King of a#	1873
His poisoned shafts	July, 1873	The merry elves#	1873
I found to-day	June, 1872	The wood is bare	1872
I heard a linnet	(1869)	'Twas midnight#	June, 1872
I made another song	1873	Two beds there were#	1872, Parts II, III in 1873
In my most serious#	July, 1873, lines 5-10, 1868	When first we met	Aug, 1873
In ten years hence#	Jan, 1873	When I sit to write#	(1869)
Into thy youngheart#	July, 1873	When King Darius#	1873
In wooing and in#	Aug, 1873	Who has not walked	Sept, 1872
I sat one winter's#	1873	Woe to the friend#	July, 1873
I shall not see#	July, 1873		
I will not let thee go	July, 1872		
Long are the hours	Aug, 1872		

# Not reprinted in later volumes

ALBERT GUÉRARD, JR

Harvard University

<sup>1</sup> "Robert Bridges," *DNB*, 1922 1930, pp 116-7

<sup>2</sup> Bridges, R, *Poems* (London, 1873), p 126

## ARNOLD, SHELLEY, AND JOUBERT

Matthew Arnold's familiar quotation at the conclusion of his "Shelley" appears also in his "Byron" essay where it was first printed. The "beautiful and ineffectual angel" reference seems to have been suggested by a passage in Joubert which Arnold translates (in his essay on "Joubert") thus: "Plato loses himself in the void but one sees the play of his wings, one hears their rustle."

WILLIAM S. KNICKERBOCKER

*University of the South*

URFAUST L 309<sup>1</sup>

When Mephistopheles has finished advising the student of the *Urfaust* about rooms, he immediately takes up the problem of board:

Euer Logie war nun bestellt                      306  
Nun euen Tisch fur leidlich Geld<sup>1</sup>

Two lines of the student follow immediately:

Mich dunkt, das gab sich alle nach,  
Wer erst von Geisteserweiterung sprach<sup>1</sup>

They are disregarded by Mephistopheles, however, who sticks to the text he has chosen, and, unfortunately, they seem to have received little attention from editors and commentators.

The student's words have always been printed as above, both in those editions which, like the original of Erich Schmidt, follow the Gochhausen manuscript as closely as possible,<sup>2</sup> and in those which emend or modify the text in order to make it uniform within itself or with manuscripts in Goethe's own hand.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, there have

<sup>1</sup> The lines are numbered as printed (unnumbered) in the *Weltgoethe* edition, Bd. 12, ed. Max Hecker (1937 = 2nd redaction).

<sup>2</sup> E. Schmidt, *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt* (1894<sup>3</sup>) *dunkt, Geists Erweiterung*, M. Morris, *Der junge Goethe* 5:372 *dunket, Geists Erweiterung*, neither has a comma before *das gab*. Only the orthography (modernized) of *Geisteserweiterung* has been changed in the lines quoted above.

<sup>3</sup> *E g Weltgoethe* (v note 1)

been no editions in modern German orthography which print these lines in any other way,<sup>4</sup> nor have scholars in quoting them made any changes, even when consistently modernizing their quotations from Goethe<sup>5</sup>

Certainly it cannot be claimed, however, that the meaning of the two lines as printed above is apparent upon a first reading, although it is clear from the context that the student would like to dissociate the problem of his physical wants from that of his intellectual development, which he considers more important. Be this as it may, the construction, when discussed at all, has been explained as an ellipsis. An American edition has the note

gab' sich alle nach, Wer , usw "kame alles nach und nach von selbst für den, der ,," usw<sup>6</sup>

and a Danish

Wer = demjenigen, der "det vilde altsammen bagefter give sig for den, som først talte om Aandsudvikling"<sup>7</sup>

Neither explanation accounts for the form *sprach*, which would have to be explained away as a sort of potential subjunctive ("for him who should speak"), since no one has actually spoken of *Geistserweiterung*. Moreover, Goethe would be charged with the omission of the umlaut for the sake of a rhyme with *nach*, or it might be claimed that the indicative form has been substituted for the regular subjunctive by analogy with the substitution common in certain conditional sentences. The explanation of *wer* is plausible because it is simple, but when closer examination reveals so many and such unusual corollaries, its simplicity and, accordingly, its plausibility cease to exist.

All difficulties are removed, however, if l. 309 is read *War' erst von Geistserweiterung Sprach'*. This reading accords with Goethe's usage and with the orthographic peculiarities of the Gochhausen

<sup>4</sup> *E.g.* The Danish and American school editions mentioned in notes 6 and 7, below

<sup>5</sup> *E.g.* E. Kuhnemann, *Goethe* (Lzg. 1930) 1. 125, C. Sarauw, *Goethes Augen* (K. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab hist.-filol. Meddelelser II, 3. 1919), p. 137, cites only l. 309.

<sup>6</sup> *Goethe's "Urfaust"* Edited by Lenz & Nock (New York, London, Harper & Brothers, 1938), p. 19

<sup>7</sup> *Urfaust Goethes Faust i dens ældste skikkelse* Carl V. Oestergaard (København 1918), p. 125

manuscript Fraulein von Gochhausen frequently substituted *e* for *a*, especially when the latter recurred in successive lines. For example, in the song *Es war ein Ratt im Kellernest*, she wrote

Bald hätt das arme Tier genug,  
Als hett es Lieb im Leibe<sup>9</sup>

Moreover, she sometimes used a small *s* instead of the capital, as in l 50 of the manuscript,<sup>9</sup> so that both changes can be considered as corrections of natural slips of the pen. As for the expression *von etwas Sprache sein* in the sense of *davon Rede sein*, which has been noted as used both in Leipzig and the Rheinland,<sup>10</sup> it is found in the *Theatralische Sendung* (*Erstes Buch, Neuntes Kapitel* = *Lehrjahre, Siebentes Kapitel*)

Weil der Gottfried, von dem die Sprache war, nicht herauskommen wollte, so musste ich wieder abziehen

Thus the two lines form a complete sentence, a condition with both its clauses, with no ellipses whatsoever

The English translations of the student's two lines have not been very satisfactory. McLintock reproduces the German with

I think the terms should that include  
For one who comes for mental food<sup>11</sup>

Van der Smissen comes very close with

That ought to come of its own accord  
Would you but speak of spiritual food!<sup>12</sup>

It can be objected to the latter translation, however, that there was no reason to disregard the punctuation of the Gochhausen manuscript, which errs rather in its omissions than in its insertions, especially since the result implied that in the German original there are two incomplete conditions contrary to fact in present time.

<sup>9</sup> E Schmidt, *op cit*, p 21

<sup>10</sup> M Morris, *op cit* 6 531 "staubbedeckt ist in der Hs undeutlich korrigiert st aus St oder umgekehrt"

<sup>11</sup> Cf K Albrecht, *Die Leipziger Mundart* (Lzg 1881), p 214 "Sprache f Rede, Gespräch —es ist die Sprache davon, dass eine neue Bahn gebaut werden soll, es war eben die Sprache davon, davon is gar geene Sprache = das behauptet Niemand, Rh [i e Rheinland]"

<sup>12</sup> R McLintock, *Goethe's 'Faust'* (London, 1897), p 90

<sup>13</sup> W H. Van der Smissen, *Goethe's Faust* (London & Toronto 1928), p 397

Since there are striking verbal parallelisms between lines in the *Faust* known to have been written many years apart, it would hardly be wise to argue from the use of *Sprache sein* in both the *Urfaut* and the *Sendung* that the student scene was written toward the end of 1776 or the beginning of 1777, the apparent time of the inception of the *Sendung*, or that both works were conceived and begun in Leipzig at about the same time<sup>13</sup>

Dartmouth College

STUART ATKINS

#### FOUR TEXT-NOTES ON *DEOR*

##### I

Lines 3 f deal with the misery of the tormented Weland,

hæfde him to gesiþþe sorge ond longað,  
wintercealde wræce

The sentence contains two figures no doubt used by the poet with a conscious artistry. With one, the epithet *winterceald* 'bitter, severe' (cp. espec *Wanderer* 24), I have already dealt elsewhere<sup>1</sup>. The other, personification of cares, is of course found universally. But for the idea of sorrow's companionship there is a close parallel already noted by Fr Klaeber<sup>2</sup> in *Wanderer* 29 f

Wat se þe cunnað  
hu sliþen bið sorg to geferan

Cp also *Salomon & Sat.* 346 f.

forhwan beoð ða gesiðas somod ætgædre,  
wop ond hleahtor?

and in later times *Pearl* 371 *Of care & me 3e made accorde*, and Shakespeare's *Pericles*, I, 2 2 *The sad companion, dull-eyed melancholy*

The interesting MS form *gesiþþe* for *gesiþe*, dat sg, is usually

<sup>13</sup> The *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, under *Sprache* (col 2722), gives no other instance of the usage in literary German than that in the *Lehrjahre*. P Fischer, *Goethe-Wortschatz*, p 587, also gives only the reference to the *Lehrjahre* and comments "*ungewöhnlich*"

<sup>1</sup> *PQ*, xvii (1938), 365 ff

<sup>2</sup> *Anglia Beibl*, xxxii (1921), 40, n 1

considered to illustrate a late doubling, "which doubtless arose in the nom acc sg and was then leveled into the inflected forms"<sup>3</sup> For this there would be parallel examples in other late West-Saxon verse texts But a simpler explanation is possible for the double consonant in the MS (*Exeter Book*, fol 100a) the words are spaced *toge sipppe*, and there may conceivably have been scribal confusion here with the word *sippan* in line 5

The form *gesipppe* has however been explained as a regular dat sg form of *gesipp*, neut 'companionship'<sup>4</sup> In view of the *Wanderer* parallel, this explanation is doubtful, and unnecessary when we see the use of *to* with a concrete word in the dat sg to be thoroughly idiomatic even where the explanatory reference concerns more than one, e g *Exeter Gnomes* (C) 147 *to geferan*,<sup>5</sup> and analogous phrases like *Maldon* 46 *to gafole* and *Be Domes Dæge* 190 *to sorge*<sup>6</sup>

## II

Lines 11b f come in the second section of *Deor*, which gives the only direct allusion in Old English literature to the sad affair of Beadohild, griefstricken at her pregnancy

æfne ne meahte  
þriste geþencan hu ymb þæt sceolde

Line 12b is a bold elliptic construction which through successive commentaries on the poem has remained ambiguous Usually it is taken as impersonal, and the infinitive to be supplied after *sceolde* is given as *weorðan* 'to happen, turn out'<sup>7</sup> If this impersonal construction be accepted, it would still be impossible to agree with the view of A J Wyatt, who rendered this half-line 'how that should be so,' taking the allusion to be to Beadohild's wonder how she came to be with child<sup>8</sup> This view is impaired by the use

<sup>3</sup> Kemp Malone, *Deor* (1933), pp 18 f

<sup>4</sup> E Ekwall, *MLR*, xxix (1934), 81, cf also T Grienberger, *Anglia*, xlv (1921), 400

<sup>5</sup> Wrongly glossed as dat pl in B C Williams's ed, *Gnomic Poetry in Aes*, 1914, pp 141, 159

<sup>6</sup> Changed to the equivalent adverb *sorhlice* in the adapted prose version of the poem, discovered by Napier and printed in Grein-Wulker, II, 257 ff

<sup>7</sup> F Holthausen, *Beowulf*, etc, II, 5th ed (1929), 196, Malone, ed, p 24 Cf Grienberger, *loc cit*, p 399

<sup>8</sup> *Aes Reader* (1919), p 261 In the Eddic poem, Þoðvildr was first offered drugged wine by the smith, then ravished when unconscious

of *æfre* 11 'ever' and *þrste* 12 'resolutely, confidently,' which serve to show that the true reference is future. The correct rendering of 12b as impersonal would thus be rather '(never might she, Beadohild, think resolutely) how it would turn out,' that is, what would be the end of her affair.

Whichever way we take it, the impersonal usage would be hard to parallel and involves a change of subject which may cause us to hesitate in agreeing with it. It seems to me more likely the phrase is not impersonal at all, that for *sceolde* just as for *meahte* 11b, the subject is 'she,' Beadohild. A prose construction with identical or very similar ellipsis deserves to be noted here as shedding valuable light on the *Deor* phrase. Two instances of it are found in the *OE Chron*, 870 F (ed. Plummer, I, 284) *se arcebisceop na þar embe beon* [*mhte*, suppl. Plummer], and 1009 E *þa cyððe man into þære scripfyrðe þæt he mann eaðe befan mhte, gif man ymbe beon wolde* (C *gif man embe wære*). In the collection of sermons ascribed to Wulfstan (ed. Napier, 1883) similar phrases come frequently p. 38, line 5 f, *he* (i. e. the devil) *byð æfre ymb þæt an . . .*, similarly 191 10, 301. 7, p. 129, line 10 f *uton ðon, swa us þearf is, beon ymbe þa bote*, similarly 268 30, cf. also 136. 11 ff, 271 30 ff, etc.

In all these examples there can be no doubt the elliptic construction *ymbe wesan* or *beon*, is the OE equivalent of the modern idiom 'to be about (something),' e. g., *Luke* 2 49 (AV), or more usually 'to go about, deal with, see to,' etc., and that it is not impersonal. It seems a safe conclusion that we have this same idiom here in *Deor*, that Beadohild is again subject of the clause 12b 'how she must go about it,' that is, deal with her sad situation. Then either *beon* or *wesan* is the verb understood.

### III

At line 25a *wear on wenan*, Klaeber was undoubtedly right in taking *wenan* as dat. pl. with sg. meaning, 'in expectation of sorrow.'<sup>9</sup> He compared *Beowulf* 2895, *Andreas* 1087, *Genesis* 1985 (*wenan*), *Exodus* 165 (*wenan*), 176, 213, where not noted the form found is *wenum*. There are some other verse instances proving the rightness of this construction and showing beyond doubt (a) that *on wenan* with gen. is a formula-phrase equivalent to a

<sup>9</sup> *Loc. cit.*, p. 39

pres participle 'hoping for, expecting,' and (b) that *wenan* wherever it occurs in this phrase must be a late form of the regular dat pl *wenum*, viz *Genesis* 1027, 2701, *Be Domes Dage* 174, *Husband's Message* 28, *Elene* 584<sup>10</sup> Closely parallel would be the phrase *morðres on luste* in *Andreas* 1140

## IV

36 þæt ic hwile wæs Heodeninga scop,  
dryhtne dyre

It is instructive to realize the full force intended in this pseudo-personal declaration of the poet. The term *hwile* is not merely, as sometimes translated or glossed, 'for a while, for a time,' but means 'for a very long time'—as the poet goes on to reveal (in line 38). Also, *dryhtne dyre* is not just 'dear to my lord' Other instances show the expression is again a formula, practically equivalent to 'especially dear to my lord' or 'my lord's favorite' Elsewhere in verse it is used particularly of those who come under special divine favor, such as Satan before his fall (*Genesis* (B) 261) or Christ enthroned in heaven (Christ 1650 f) To the 'tribe of Seth' (*Genesis* 1247) and the apostles Simon and Judas (*Menologium* 191 f), the exact phrase *Drihtne dyre* is applied; while at *Elene* 290 ff, St Helena exhorting the Jews reminds them they were the race elect, *Dryhtne dyre* Here in *Deor* also the value 'specially favored' would give an added touch of poignancy to the passage

University of London

L. WHITBREAD

## ARCITE'S MAYING

By aventure his wey he gan to holde,  
To maken hym a gerland of the greves  
Were it of wodebynde or hawethorn leues,  
And loude he song ayeyn the sonne shene  
"May, with alle thy floures and thy grene,  
Welcome be thou, faire, fresshe May,  
In hope that I som grene gete may"  
And from his courser, with a lusty herte,  
Into the grove ful hastily he sterte

Knight's Tale 1506 14, *Chaucer's Complete Works*,  
ed F N Robinson, Boston, 1933

<sup>10</sup> Wrongly glossed in A S Cook's ed (1919) as dat sg of *wena*.



In the OF *Heures de Turin*, part of a book of hours made for Chaucer's contemporary, the princely bibliophile, Jean, Duc de Berry, there is an illustration well worth attention. Folios 1-12 of the *Heures de Turin*<sup>1</sup> comprise a Calendar of Months, each folio being beautifully illustrated on its lower margin with a scene typical of the season. The illustration for May is entitled by the editor "promenade à cheval au mois de mai." In it a company of aristocratic people have ridden out apparently to enjoy the fresh air, the song of the birds, the blossoms, and the vivid green of the young foliage. One lady, it is true, shows us that her tastes are more practical than aesthetic, for she carries a hawk on wrist, and is attended by a young boy on foot—for the service of the hawk. But the actions of two of the riders are of particular interest. One of them, a young man, has reined in his horse below a tree. With his sword in his right hand he is slicing off young branches from its lower limbs. Another youth is snapping off branches by hand, as he leans from his saddle towards the tree. Why both seem intent upon acquiring green branches or blossoms we know not. Are they culled for a garland or for the decoration of the house?

My surmise is that there is nothing particularly strange or untoward in the actions of the young men of the picture, and, *per consequens*, with those of Arcite in the poem. The fact that the illustration is one made for a Calendar of Months indicates that the actors of May are doing a usual thing, one that anyone, gentle or simple, might be expected to do, as the fancy struck him, in the month of May. Whether Arcite's intention to collect greenery was because of his membership in the "Company of the Flower" or that "of the Leaf" we do not know.<sup>2</sup> We do know that no one who saw

<sup>1</sup> The illustrations of the Ms. (Biblioteca Nazionale K. iv, 29) have been reproduced in P. Durieu, *Les Heures de Turin*, Paris, 1902.

<sup>2</sup> Professor J. M. Manly (*Canterbury Tales*, New York, 1928, note on line 1512) suggests that line 1512 was written "probably with reference to the controversy of 'the flower and the leaf'." Any opinion of Professor Manly on Chaucer deserves attention, yet the representation in a Calendar of Months of young gentlemen plucking leaves or blossoms in May, tells against his suggestion.

Furthermore the fact that other months show labours appropriate to themselves (February, faggot-cutting, August, wheat-cutting) indicates that the artist had no idea of making his Calendar a record of occupations or pursuits that belonged specifically to the nobility and upper classes. Manly's suggestion might have greater likelihood of being true, had the artist done so.

him lopping or plucking off branches or stalks would have supposed him to have been doing anything very unusual, or suspected that by that action he was proclaiming his allegiance to the Flower or to the Leaf. Since May 1-3 appear to have been the regular days of the May-time festival,<sup>3</sup> Robert Herrick's *Corinna's going a-Maying* perhaps best explains his aspirations and intentions

Princeton University

HENRY SAVAGE

"AS BY THE WHELP CHASTISED IS THE LEON"

In Chaucer's *Squire's Tale* (F 490-91) the falcon decides to tell her personal history to Canacee in order

to maken othere be war by me,  
As by the whelp chastised is the leon

Skeat's note on this passage quotes *Othello*, George Herbert and Cotgrave for the proverb, and other commentators have traced the saying back to various proverbial forms and to Jacobus de Voragine, Vincent of Beauvais, Bartholomeus Anglicus, and even St Ambrose.<sup>1</sup> All these studies, however, deal with a proverbial saying rather than an actual practice, and seem to refer the idea to legend or error. In fact, Tatlock's note, in seeking an origin for "the thing," even suggests a misunderstanding of an anecdote about Alexander the Great's dog. No one seems to have associated Chaucer's passage with the evidence that, with certain cautious reservations, lion tamers of the 13th century apparently did beat dogs in order to intimidate their pets. Villard de Honnecourt (fl 1240) was an architect whose sketch-book, published in facsimile in 1858, shows a wide interest in the science, arts, and customs of his time. G. G. Coulton's *Life in the Middle Ages* (II, 53-54) reproduces a drawing

<sup>3</sup> See Miss Hammond, *English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey*, Durham, N. C., 1927, p. 472. Since Arcite sallied out "to doon his observaunce to May," his maying is probably on the last regular day of the festival, for Palamon broke gaol after May 1 (see line 1463). Miss Hammond's reference, therefore, lends support to Manly's reading of "the thridde nyght" as "the night preceding the third day." My thanks for good advice are due my colleague, G. H. Gerould.

<sup>1</sup> See Holthausen, *Anglia*, XIV, 320; Lowes, *Archiv*, CXXIV, 132; and Tatlock, *MLN*, XXXVIII, 506-507.

of a lion-tamer, with its accompanying text, from Villard's book. The lion is chained to a stake, and just beyond his reach stands the trainer with his two dogs. In each hand he has the chain of one of his dogs, and in his right hand he holds also a whip made of several twigs attached to a handle. The Old French text is difficult to make out in Coulton's reproduction of the sketch, but his translation of it runs

Now will I speak to you of the instruction of the lion. He who would teach the lion hath two dogs. When he would fain make the lion do anything, he commandeth him to do it, and if the lion murmur, then he beateth the dogs, whereof the lion misdoubteth him sore, when he seeth the dogs beaten, wherefore he refraineth his courage and doeth that which hath been commanded. And if the lion be wroth, thereof will I speak no whit, for then would he obey neither for good nor evil usage. And know well that this lion here was portrayed from the life.

The last sentence, together with the general range of contemporary interests in Villard's sketch-book, suggests that he had actually seen this method of lion-taming attempted, and we may infer that Chaucer was referring to a matter of common knowledge and possibly current practice, rather than to a learned proverb of obscure origin.

CALVIN S. BROWN, JR.  
ROBERT H. WEST

*The University of Georgia*

---

#### WILLIAM TAYLOR OF NORWICH AND *BEOWULF*

The first edition of *Beowulf*, Thorpe's *De Danorum Rebus Gestis*, produced only one review in England, by an anonymous writer in the *Monthly Review* in 1816. It seems to have remained unnoticed that this article is identical with the chapter on *Beowulf* in William Taylor's *Historic Survey of German Poetry* (1830), much of the substance of which consisted of former articles, and that it is credited to Taylor in a list of his reviews given in Robberds's amorphous *Memor*.<sup>1</sup> In this list, which was drawn up by Taylor himself, the name of the editor is spelled *Thorpelín*. Having failed to notice these facts, R. W. Chambers—to take a most dis-

<sup>1</sup> *Memor of the Life and Writings of the late William Taylor of Norwich*, II, 469.

tinguished example—calls the reviewer “an anonymous scholar,”<sup>2</sup> and in his bibliography gives the item twice, in one place saying that it gave an account of *Beowulf* “less inaccurate than Turner’s summary,” in another stating that “Taylor’s attempt is not fortunate, and he often goes wrong where Turner, in his edition of 1820, had got the sense right”<sup>3</sup> These contradictory descriptions of the one article may be resolved by noticing the dates; what had been an advance in 1816 was definitely outdistanced in 1830 Taylor’s account, which as a matter of fact is extremely inaccurate, was a great improvement over that in Turner’s first edition, which had treated Hrothgar and Beowulf as enemies By means of this review, Taylor, who as an early interpreter of German literature occupies an honorable place in the history of English literature, becomes of some importance in *Beowulf* scholarship His report of the poem was the best available between 1816 and 1820, and as Chambers says,<sup>4</sup> he was the first to suggest the identification of the Beaw Scheldwaing of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Beowulf of the poem, a theory which from Kemble’s time on has had a number of adherents

FRANKLIN COOLEY

*University of Maryland*

#### SOURCE OF THE QUOTATION FROM AUGUSTINE IN *THE PARSON'S TALE*, 985

The quotation from Augustine, found in *The Parson's Tale*, 985, has never been identified<sup>1</sup> The passage in question reads “And herof seith Seint Augustyn ‘The herte travaillet for shame of his synne’, and for he hath greet shamefastnesse, he is digne to have greet mercy of God” Miss Petersen suspected that the quotation from Augustine might extend to the end of the sentence.<sup>2</sup> In

<sup>2</sup> *Beowulf*, *An Introduction* (1932), p. 292

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 515 & 539 The summary referred to is in Turner’s *History of the Anglo Saxons* (1805), iv, 398 ff

<sup>4</sup> *Beowulf*, *An Introduction*, p. 292

<sup>1</sup> See F. N. Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (Boston, 1933), p. 880

<sup>2</sup> See Kate Oelzner Petersen, *The Sources of The Parson's Tale* (Boston, 1901), p. 19, note 2

this she was right. The passage may be found in Augustine's *Liber de Vera et Falsa Poenitentia*, X, 25. "Laborat enim mens patiando crubescantiam. Et quoniam verecundia magna est poena, qui erubescit pro Christo, fit dignus misericordia."<sup>3</sup>

KEVIN GUINAGH

*Eastern State Teachers College,  
Charleston, Illinois*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*A Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine* By ARTHUR SEWELL  
London [and New York] Oxford University Press, 1939  
Pp xvi + 214 \$2.50.

The author is not concerned with Milton's *De Doctrina Christiana* alone, but with the development and final form of "Milton's Christian doctrine," that is, with the views on theology apparent in all of Milton's writings. The first chapter deals with "The Treatise on Christian Doctrine," its composition, revision, transcription, and the chief heretical passages. The next, entitled Ames and Wollebius, discusses two important sources of Milton's treatise. It is not long enough for full treatment, and apparently contains nothing from Mr. Maurice Kelley's article on Milton and Wollebius (*PMLA*, L, 1935, 156 ff.). The next two chapters are concerned with doctrinal passages in Milton's earlier works, and in *Paradise Lost*, treated at length. Then follows another chapter on *De Doctrina Christiana*, a somewhat philosophical attempt to enter into the mind of the poet and to understand his doctrinal perplexities. This comes after the chapter on *Paradise Lost* because of the author's view that the treatise as we have it is essentially later than the epic. The final chapter deals briefly with the last poems. It accepts the generally accepted but apparently uninvestigated view that *Samson Agonistes* is a late work, in spite of Edward Phillips' assertion. "It cannot certainly be concluded when he wrote his excellent Tragedy entitled *Samson Agonistes*."<sup>1</sup> Until there is some assurance about the date of this drama, arguments on the evolution of Milton's opinions can hardly be founded on it.

As Mr. Sewell points out, much of the treatise is in the hand of Jeremy Pickard, and is altered by cancellations and additions. The first fourteen chapters have been entirely recopied by Daniel

<sup>3</sup> Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus Completus* 40, 1122.

<sup>1</sup> Helen Darbishire, *The Early Lives of Milton*, London, 1932, p. 75.

Skinner, possibly because they were still more corrected than the later sections. These fourteen chapters also contain a great part of Milton's unorthodox opinion. Mr Sewell infers, then, that the unorthodoxy of Milton must begin not earlier than 1657, the date assigned for Pickard's first work as secretary. From this follows easily the belief that much of the treatise as it stands is synchronous with or even subsequent to *Paradise Lost*, apparently completed about 1663. Since Mr. Sewell traced the evolution of the treatise in his paper of 1934, he is well aware that its beginnings go back to Milton's youth.

Yet to the belief that "until 1659 (or thereabouts) he [Milton] remained orthodox in many of those points of belief in which later he became most strikingly heterodox" (p. 46), Mr Sewell's arguments have not converted me. Up to 1641, Milton was Trinitarian. From the prose two later passages are cited as pertinent by Mr. Sewell, I do not know of others. The first is from *Tetrachordon*: "Wee must repaire thither where God professes to teach his servants by the prime institution, and not where we see him intending to dazle sophisters" (Columbia ed., iv. 150). Mr Sewell concludes that "God who gave the Law is therefore one with Christ of the Gospels." The word *God* refers to Genesis 11 20-25, is it necessary to make *him* refer clearly to the god of Genesis and to Jesus? But if this passage be admitted to Mr Sewell, it takes Milton's Trinitarianism to 1645. The passage from *The Treatise of Civil Power*, of 1659, is crucial: "by him redeemed who is God" (Columbia ed., vi. 30). There can be no doubt that Christ is here indicated. But the passage is not out of harmony with the fourteenth chapter of *De Doctrina Christiana*:

Is enim per quem omnia et in terra et in coelo facta sunt, etiam ipsi angeli, qui in principio erat sermo, et apud Deum Deus, etsi non summus, omnis tamen rei creatae primogenitus, ante assumptam carnem extiterit necesse est quicquid illi qui Christum merum hominem esse disputant, ad haec evadenda subtilius excogitarunt.

Incarnationem autem hanc Christi, qua is, Deus cum esset, humanam naturam assumpsit, caroque factus est, nec tamen unus numero Christus idcirco esse desinit, mysterium religionis nostrae longe maximum esse (Columbia ed., xv. 262).

And later in this chapter we read that the Mediator "Deum atque hominem et dici et esse" (xv. 272).<sup>2</sup> This fourteenth chapter is

<sup>2</sup>These passages may be considered in connection with Mr Sewell's remark, "Milton never speaks of the Son as God in *De Doctrina Christiana*—as *deus*, indeed, but not as *Deus*" (p. 48). I should take them also as applying to a passage discussed by Mr Sewell (p. 14, and *Essays and Studies*, p. 53) in which Milton writes "quod dici de Christo minus conveniret, praesertim Deo" (xv. 104, 106). It seems that the translation may be, not *especially if he is God*, but rather *especially when considered as God*.

one that apparently Skinner copied because it had been made illegible by alterations in the direction of unorthodoxy (Sewell, p. 4). Hence, the passage in *Of Civil Power*, where Milton contrasts the divine with the human, is wholly within the scope of his most unorthodox opinion. If this be true, we have no Trinitarianism in his prose later than 1645. In other words, Milton did not write as a Trinitarian after he was thirty-seven years of age.

Analogy leads one to expect this. Milton was still younger when he came to hold his great unorthodoxy of divorce. How early we do not know, but the author of the anonymous life says that he held it before he undertook to write on the subject "The lawfulness and expedience [of divorce] . . . had upon full consideration & reading good authors ben formerly his Opinion."<sup>3</sup> How did the anonymous biographer know this? If, as Mr. Sewell holds, he was John Phillips,<sup>4</sup> he may have heard his uncle express an opinion when dictating the tractate collected from Amesius and Wollebius, on reaching the subject of divorce, Milton would have diverged from then orthodox opinion to his own peculiar views. At any rate, Milton was unorthodox with respect to divorce by the time he was thirty-five. This seems late enough, in the instance of a precocious and independent mind like that of Milton. If at that age he was unorthodox as to divorce, why not as to the Trinity?

Some details may be considered. Quoting *P. L.*, v 603 ("This day I have begot") Mr. Sewell writes "On Milton's own showing in *De Doctrina Christiana*, this passage from the poem in no way proves that he believed in the generation of the Son in time" (p. 90). It seems that the following should have been mentioned "Decreto itaque suo adeoque in tempore genuit Deus Filium, decretum enim praecesserit decreti executionem necesse fuit, id quod adiecta vox *hodie* satis declarat" (Columbia ed., xiv 188).

On pp. 13-14 and 51-53 there might be a clear statement of the terms "civil law" and "Mosaic law." When Milton uses the former term in the passage quoted, he seems to refer to the laws of nations necessary to civil society. As is stated in *Tetrachordon*, the Mosaic law is evidently not binding on the consciences of Christians, for even a saying of Christ is not to become a "temporal law", it is to be interpreted "not by the written letter, but by that unerring paraphrase of Christian love and Charity, which is the summe of all commands, and the perfection" (Columbia ed., iv. 186). It would seem that the *De Doctrina Christiana* hardly advanced beyond this position in asserting that the purpose of the Mosaic law is attained in "that love of God and our neighbor, which is born of the Spirit through faith" (xvi 141).

In reference to the Holy Spirit, Mr. Sewell holds that the invoca-

<sup>3</sup> Helen Daibshire, *The Early Lives of Milton*, p. 23.

<sup>4</sup> I do not accept this identification, see "Some Critical Opinions on Milton," in *SP*, xxxiii (1936), 529. But Milton's opinion may have been reported by a pupil.

tions in *Paradise Lost* are earlier in Milton's thought than the discussion in *Christian Doctrine*, I vi, he quotes as parallel to the opening invocation the passage from *Church Government* "devout prayer to that eternall Spirit who can enrich with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his Seraphim with the hallow'd fire of his Altar to touch and purify the lips of whom he pleases" (Columbia ed., III 241) In its context in Isaiah 6, this passage is referred to Jehovah, and Milton held that the Holy Spirit might be the Father (xiv 362)<sup>5</sup>

Mr Sewell indicates that his period for study has been limited and that he does not claim finality. Perhaps this explains what appears as a shrinking from detail For example, there are quotations from the *De Doctrina Christiana* without references, and no index is provided, though the organization of the volume demands one In general, the author rightly concludes that Milton's mind was not highly philosophical, yet I am not able to feel that the work under review is sufficiently thorough to be considered important Moreover, in addition to what appears to me the fundamental error in dating the poet's unorthodoxy, there is also a fault in method, namely the assumption that passages in the poetry are to be interpreted in the same way as those in the treatise Milton was at some pains to point out that logic is the closed fist, rhetoric the open hand, and that poetry is still "less subtle and fine" than rhetoric and "more simple, sensuous and passionate" Moreover, in poetry Milton feels free to use any Biblical passage he finds convenient, and does not need to supply a commentary, it is not strange that, as Mr Sewell remarks, "eighteenth-century theologians could find *Paradise Lost ex omne parte orthodoxum*" (p 81), and that this view was disturbed only on the publication of *De Doctrina Christiana*

ALLAN H GILBERT

Duke University

---

*The Miltonic Setting, Past & Present.* By E M W TILLYARD  
Cambridge Cambridge University Press, 1938 Pp xii +  
208. \$2 75

*Milton on Himself* Edited with an Introduction and Notes by  
JOHN S. DIEKHOF New York Oxford University Press,  
1939. Pp xxxvi + 307. \$3 50

The nine essays in Dr Tillyard's volume are unified by the two themes stated in the title Four of the essays (forming slightly more than half of the book) had previously been printed but deserve a wider audience The first of these, Dr. Tillyard's brilliant

<sup>5</sup> As to the Bible, this is limited by Milton with the words *Sub Evangelio*



English Association pamphlet of 1932, removes "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" forever from the Horton period and puts them into Milton's Cambridge experience. The argument leaves little to add, although one might suggest that the Latin verses from the *Commonplace Book* were possibly an abortive poetic exercise on the theme of the First Prologue, abandoned in favor of "L'Allegro."

In a review of Grierison's *Milton and Wordsworth* and in an unpublished essay on "Milton and Protestantism" we are reminded, with some useful definitions of terms, that Milton was centrally an evangelical protestant. The Warton Lecture of 1936, tracing the epic background of Milton, is also reprinted. Two hitherto unpublished essays reply to modern detractors of Milton. Combatting the view that the poet's sensibility was simple and impoverished, Tillyard speaks "in terms of different mental levels," finding that while Milton's "unconscious" was exceptionally adjusted to the forces of life, he "owes much of his greatness to being close to primitive and elemental habits of mind." Tillyard rather inadequately answers T. S. Eliot's contention that Milton fails to give us the "feeling of being in a particular place at a particular time" with four examples of Milton's giving us that feeling. While not completely denying Eliot's further charge that Milton is deficient in sensuous appreciation, he is successful in qualifying the statement.

Two other essays deal largely with Milton and Keats, and Middleton Muir's theory of the latter's rejection of a Miltonic style is devastatingly attacked. Parallels in the mental growth of the two poets are stressed, and Tillyard repeats his illuminating if oversimplified exposition of "Lycidas" while comparing it to the "Ode to a Nightingale" in structure and theme. Additional charges against Milton's style—remote grandeur, inorganic method, latinization—are shrewdly analyzed and answered.

The final essay, "The Growth of Milton's Epic Plans," seems to me the weakest. Having several times accused Eliot of reading Milton out of his context, Tillyard here falls into the same easy error, finding the poet in the "Vacation Exercise" enumerating "three types of poetry he would like to turn his chief talents to," "weighing in his mind two kinds of 'epic'." This literalness characterizes also Tillyard's reading of the *Elegia Sexta*, which here and in his second essay he interprets as a "personal self-dedication" to the writing of epic poetry. It is ironic that the keen critic who first noticed the connection between "L'Allegro" and the First Prologue should have overlooked the spirit and method of an academic exercise in Milton's Latin letter to his fellow-student, Diocletian.

If I may put the case briefly, Milton turns his friend's excuse for not composing verse into the theme of a rhetorical "debate," discussing each side learnedly from a single point of view. For thirty-three lines, in what E. K. Rand calls "a pretty vein of banter," he

defends the thesis that song and feasting belong together, citing various authorities and illustrations—as he had been taught to do. The authorities are deities in classical mythology, the illustrations are Greek and Latin poets—and (a felicitous touch) Diodati himself! Finally the theme is enlarged: poetry belongs not only with feasting, but also with music, dancing, and love. There is a six-line summary which returns to the main theme: many gods patronize the elegiac poet, for whom feasting is proper. In representing the case for temperance (the original statement of it was Diodati's) Milton needs only twenty-five lines. His method is the same, although his tone, obeying the laws of decorum, changes from cheerful to grave. It is the epic poet who must live sparingly. Confronted with the difficulty of citing authorities for spare living among the Greek *gods*, Milton, instead of turning to the Bible, apparently invents a few appropriate details about Tiresias, Linus, Calchas, and Orpheus. As an illustration he does not mention Virgil, but, contradicting Horace and (to a certain extent) his own later account in the *Apology*, he offers the Homer of the *Odyssey*. He does not mention himself as an aspirant to epic honors (although he had cited Diodati as an elegiac poet), but gives Pythagoras as an example of living sparingly, and uses him to enlarge his theme again (as he had used Diodati in the first argument). Besides temperance, epic poetry also belongs with purity, chastity, and blameless behavior. This side of the "debate," like the preceding, ends by pointing out that the bard is sacred to the gods. Every element in the defence of feasting is present in the shorter defence of temperance. The parallelism is not precise, but neither is it in "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso." Yet Dr. Tillyard would here, I think, make Milton "Il Penseroso" and not "L'Allegro." Although he is far from alone in this interpretation, he has drawn more inferences from it than any other student of Milton, and I find it one of the few blemishes in his valuable study of *The Miltonic Setting*.

Mr. Diekhoff collects those passages of verse and prose in which Milton writes of himself or his work. The idea is not a new one; Henry Corson made a similar selection in 1899, and in 1872 J. G. Graham published an *Autobiography of John Milton, or Milton's Life in His Own Words*. Like his predecessors Diekhoff sees fit to modernize spelling and punctuation. Unlike them he had the text of the Columbia *Milton* to select from; he has tried to collect *all* the excerpts, and he has wisely omitted dubious passages, choosing only those in which Milton avowedly is autobiographical. In this book, for a change, Samson and Satan cease being Milton, and attention is at last paid to Milton's warning in the *Defensio Prima* (which, oddly enough, Diekhoff does not quote): "We must not regard the poet's words as his own, but consider who it is that speaks."

Some readers may object to Diekhoff's admittedly arbitrary

classification of the extracts into fourteen groups, but the editor is surely right in saying "To arrange Milton's words into a coherent chronological account of his life is impossible, I think, to present them in the order of their composition would result in chaos" If we must have *Milton on Himself*, we must have some subject classification such as this editor gives us, and we may thank him for frequent cross reference and useful notes

Although it seems to Mr Diekhoff "above all things desirable that Milton should be allowed to speak for himself," a 24-page introduction offers guidance to the reader Here one may be permitted occasionally to differ with the editor It is well to be reminded, for example, of Mary Powell's influence on Milton's thought, but we cannot agree that Milton's failure to speak of her in print is "significant" On the other hand, Mr Diekhoff defends his author's trustworthiness in autobiography with truly uncommon commonsense

WILLIAM R PARKER

*The Ohio State University*

*Defoe's Review* Reproduced from the Original Editions, with an Introduction and Bibliographical Notes by ARTHUR WELLESLEY SECORD Nine vols in twenty-two facsimile books New York Columbia University Press, 1938 \$88 00 (Publication No 44 of the Facsimile Text Society)

The reissue of Defoe's *Review*, by far the most ambitious project hitherto undertaken by the Facsimile Text Society, now stands complete as a most remarkable piece of cooperative scholarship An eighteenth century newspaper file extending to over 5600 pages and running continuously for over nine years is something that a library or a collector can seldom hope to acquire Any library, indeed, which tries to meet the needs of students of eighteenth century literature and history would be glad to take this much primary material, good, bad, and indifferent, at less than a cent and a half a page Yet the mere bulk of the matter and the rarity of the file are not the most noteworthy things about this edition

The project has had an interesting history First proposed by the Facsimile Text Society in 1929, it was revived in 1933 and successfully underwritten by subscription Thereupon the bibliographical problems connected with the *Review* were attacked as they never had been before The late Professor Greenough did important spadework, although ill health finally forced him to withdraw Professor Secord, who had been active at all stages of the undertaking, then took over the editorship Eventually the most important American sets, those in the possession of the Boston Public Library (Tient

Collection), Mr Arch W Shaw, the University of Texas Library, and the Yale University Library were brought together for study. As Secord writes, "Since Defoe's day, probably so many sets have not been together or another Defoe investigator had such an opportunity as I to compare them." While this comparison could not of course extend to all the minutiae of the text, it has led to a precise description of the structure of a complete set of the *Review*, the recording of significant variations, a systematic account of the Edinburgh edition, and many other important contributions. All future study of the *Review* will be based on Secord's Introduction and Bibliographical Notes.

In selecting texts for reproduction it was necessary to choose a page now from one set, now from another, as more suitable for photographing. The disadvantage of this arrangement has been largely offset by check-lists which indicate the provenience of each page, and the advantage is that the physical discomfort of reading an eighteenth century newspaper is reduced to a minimum. Inevitably some pages are smudged and in a few cases the type curves at the binding edge. The unevenness of color from page to page and on a single page is, as a notice in the Introduction says, approximately reproduced, but against the white background such variations do not seriously affect legibility. The division of the nine volumes into twenty-two facsimile books is a happy arrangement, it will be a pleasant and novel experience for readers of eighteenth century newspapers to handle these light and manageable books instead of the clumsy volumes in which such material is often bound up.

Most students have had to take a great part of Defoe on trust, although they must have felt qualms about their dependence on second-hand reports. To a certain extent they will have to continue to do so, unless they are near one of the large collections and qualify as specialists in Defoe and his times, but this reprint goes far toward mending matters for the scholar who wants a sound though not minutely specialized knowledge of the subject. The effect of newspaper-reading is cumulative, the policy of an editor, his endless reiteration of favorite ideas, and his shifts of direction and emphasis work out as a practical initiation into his age. At first it may seem that this is largely surface-play, but soon we detect important currents of ideas as well, when we have to do with a man like Defoe. His disingenuousness does not utterly discredit him. The *Review* is a political organ, Harley is always to be reckoned with, and the reader will get some practice in analyzing speciousness as he follows Defoe's utterances through months and years on such subjects as the prospect of peace, the position of the Church in Scotland, and the attitude which a good Williamite is to take toward the government of 1710. The attempt at political manipulation of the dissenting interest was inevitable. There is something hollow in Defoe's quick assumption of position after position which

shall mollify the Dissenters and at the same time help Harley. He shows gratuitous zeal against the theater, especially in Volume III. He is too ready to portray himself as virtuous and persecuted. But there is no mistaking his eagerness to get on to something more substantial. Throughout Volume VII he advertises a project for a review to be entirely devoted to trade, since "the fury of the times" keeps him from treating that subject adequately in the present periodical. Professor Moore, drawing largely on the *Review*, has already shown the underlying consistency and importance of Defoe's economic views.<sup>1</sup> When Defoe discusses the nature of credit, government finance, poor relief, bankruptcy and imprisonment for debt, foreign and colonial trade, he is never tired of reiterating his favorite ideas and always furnishes abundant copy for the printer. There are many cross-references to his other works—to the hostile discussion of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in *The Poor Man's Plea* and the long satire called *Reformation of Manners*, to *The True-Born Englishman*, *The Shortest Way*, and *The Consolidator*, and there are interesting outcroppings of subject-matter which reappear in his later works on travel and economics and in his fiction as well. The hitherto inaccessible Volume IX gives important new evidence about his troubles in connection with the two nonical pamphlets of 1713, *What if the Pretender Should Come?* and *Reasons against the Succession of the House of Hanover*. But it is impossible to anticipate the working of this rich mine of material.

The student will be glad to restudy the familiar theme of the relation of the *Review* to the other periodicals of the age, and can now examine at leisure the famous "Advice to the Scandal Club" and its successor the *Little Review*. Defoe seems to be embarrassed at finding that the entertaining question-and-answer method which he took over from Dunton threatens to divert him from his primary political purpose. He does not go far toward admitting a casual variety of light topics and enlisting the cooperation of his interested readers, he professes to be impatient at the humor of the age which will not allow him to treat one subject continuously. He hails Isaac Bickerstaff as one who has taken over the office of the Scandal Club (VI, No. 141, March 2, 1710), but he thinks that such a reformer must deal with a "mass of filth." Thereafter he himself is influenced by the *Tatler* and later the *Spectator*, but he has his doubts about the efficacy of the light touch of Steele and Addison. "The *Tatler* and *Spectator*, that happy Favourite of the Times, has pleas'd you all, . . . But alas! Are we to be laugh'd out of our Follies?" (VIII, No. 61, August 14, 1711).

*The Rice Institute*

ALAN D. McKILLOP

<sup>1</sup> John Robert Moore, *Daniel Defoe and Modern Economic Theory*, Bloomington, Ind., 1935. Indiana University Studies, XXI, No. 104.

*The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex* By JOHN BANKS  
 Edited by THOMAS MARSHALL HOWE BLAIR New York  
 Columbia University Press, 1939 Pp xiv + 62 + sig A 1-4  
 + pp 80 + pp 63—148 \$2 75

In this, the first edition of *The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex* since 1769, Mr T M H Blair has revived for the modern reader the earliest English play on the romantic theme of Elizabeth and Essex. Following Mr Allardyce Nicoll, he considers the author, John Banks, as the forerunner of Nicholas Rowe in the discovery of the "she-tragedy," with its exploitation of heroines rather than heroes, its opportunities for the new actresses of the Restoration, its continual accent on pathos, and its direct appeal to the female part of the audience. This estimate of Banks's originality as the discoverer of "she-tragedy" would seem to be historically justified, although the phrase was not the invention of Nicoll, as Blair implies, but was rather used by Rowe himself, at least as early as his epilogue to *Jane Shore*. Although *The Unhappy Favourite* is not a full-fledged example of the type, since Essex engages its author's attention even more than does Elizabeth, it marks the path which Banks was later to follow in his attempt at feminization of the theater and in his patriotic interest in themes of English history as opposed to the foreign material of most of his heroic contemporaries.

The main text consists of a photo-offset facsimile of the 1682 edition. This method both recreates the atmosphere of an original and avoids the usual human errors attendant on a reproduction in modern type. It would have been well, however, to devote a special section to the correction of the errors in the original text rather than to run these corrections in with the rest of the notes, where they seem alien. Moreover, some of these errors have been overlooked, as in the case of "Dop" for "Drop" in the epilogue.

The notes afford a valuable running commentary on most of Banks's plays, their sources, and adaptations, but especially on the Elizabeth and Essex story on the stage from Thomas Corneille to Maxwell Anderson. On the other hand, they might sometimes deal more thoroughly with the text itself than they do. For instance, if—as on page 72—it seems desirable to comment on Banks's use of *straight* as an adverb, it would seem even more desirable to deal with the allusion to St Christopher a little further on in the same scene. Somewhat similarly, a reference in the epilogue to the visions of the "Hatfield Maid" is explained by quoting from Montague Summers, but a reference to the prophecies of the astrologer, William Lilly, a few lines earlier is passed over silently.

Mr Blair has also provided his edition with several useful introductory sections. For his biographical material he acknowledges

his indebtedness to the work of Roswell G Ham, Thomas A Kirby, and Fred S Tupper Since these data are very meager, however, it would seem probable that further investigation of the records, such as those of the Middle Temple, might have produced additional information about the little-known Banks.

Perhaps the most interesting section to the general reader is that which discusses the origin and development of the widely accepted but unfounded tradition of the ring which the queen gave her unhappy favorite to use in any desperate emergency In the search for an explanation of this romantic episode, however, one wonders whether the whole affair does not have a conventional background It might, at least, have been worth while to look for parallels to the situation in earlier fiction and plays

Students of the drama will be grateful to Mr Blair for making *The Unhappy Favourite* easily available to them and for calling their attention again to his popular old tragedy, with all its fustian echoes of the heroic play Perhaps, however, they may be pardoned for hesitating to second his pious hope that some day Banks may again be brought before the footlights

ARTHUR H NETHERCOT

*Northwestern University*

---

"Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Perceval-roman" Von WILHELM KELLERMANN Beiheft zur *ZRP* LXXXVIII (Halle, Niemeyer) Pp. 232.

Ce travail d'un débutant, élève de M. A. Hamel à Wurzburg et privatdozent à cette université, est déjà d'un maître<sup>1</sup> À une connaissance intime de tout ce qui s'est écrit en France et en Allemagne et à une familiarité en plus avec les travaux des médiévistes germanisants (qui ont introduit la *Geistesgeschichte* dans ce genre d'études) s'unit chez M. Kellermann une finesse d'observation non commune du donné dans une oeuvre littéraire, et un sens intime des particularités de la pensée médiévale, qu'il s'agit de comprendre, sans l'altérer en la modernisant ni légiférer au nom de préjugés Le bannissement de tout anachronisme équivaut à l'atteinte de la vérité profonde de l'époque traitée En partant du réel observable, toute la spéculation de l'auteur se borne à raccorder et harmoniser les traits en apparence discordants et à les intégrer dans une vue systématique de ce que peut être, étant donnée la pensée du moyen âge, telle oeuvre d'art l'exprimant. Son livre,—ne traitant que d'un seul livre, ce *Perceval* de Chrétien, et ne se laissant distraire de sa tâche ni par le biographisme, le *sourcisme*, le chauvinisme litté-

<sup>1</sup> Il a publié un article suggestif sur "Altdeutsche und altfranzösische Literatur" dans *GLM* xxv (1938)

raire (d'un G Cohen), ni par des jugements tous faits dans le style des germanisants allemands d'antan qui aimaient rabaisser Chrétien en faveur de Hartmann ou Wolfram — réussit, précisément par l'investigation *profonde* de la structure et de l'atmosphère vitale de ce roman, non seulement à éclairer le *Perceval*, mais toute l'œuvre de Chrétien et à percer un jour sur cette architecture artistique de l'art laïque du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle avec M Kellermann, nous sommes dans l'atelier cérébral du poète et nous nous mouvons avec aisance dans ce monde clos, mais diaphane. Je ne connais aucune œuvre sur un texte médiéval, qui, en limitant si strictement les recherches à un domaine plutôt restreint la composition (*Aufbauschil*) et l'organisation de la vue du monde exprimée (*Weltbild*) dans le *Perceval* — l'étude des sources est supposée, mais elles-mêmes sont en principe éliminées, de même l'étude de la langue que l'auteur nous promet de faire suivre, — arrive à des vues aussi complexes sur l'art médiéval en général. Les devanciers de notre auteur auront été MM Reto Bezzola (qui a synthétisé les opinions opposées de G Paris et de Foerster), et les germanisants G Muller, Ehrismann et Witte. Les deux notions figurant au titre n'expriment au fond qu'une même chose, vue une fois du dehors, une fois du dedans la composition du *Perceval* doit évidemment correspondre à l'idée que se faisait le poète du monde en le traduisant en œuvre épique. Chrétien apparaît comme excellent 'compositeur' dès qu'on a approfondi sa vue du monde. Et viceversa en remontant à l'unité de son roman, on s'aperçoit de la cohérence de son panorama moral. La tautologie qui résulte de cet 'aller et retour' du critique, n'est pas pour nous décourager elle est la garantie de la véracité de son interprétation.

Le *Perceval* est, d'après M Kellermann, une œuvre *courtoise*, mais à envergure plus haute que les autres œuvres de Chrétien, puisqu'elle met en action les valeurs religieuses sans nier les valeurs courtoises. Ici la notion du "gradualisme" médiéval, tel que M Gunther Muller l'a défini, s'impose les valeurs courtoises *subsistent* à leur place, même si la pensée religieuse est d'un ordre plus élevé (on pourrait ici opposer l'hérarchie des valeurs du *Polyeucte* de Corneille où l'échelon supérieur exclut ou détruit nettement l'inférieur). *Perceval* comme chevalier du *Graal* est supérieur à Gauvain, le héros courtois typique qui pourrait trouver sa place dans n'importe quel autre roman du maître de Troyes, sa courbe d'évolution, dessinée par la Providence, est plus longue et monte plus haut, mais il reste pourtant toujours le héros courtois. nulle mystique ni nul symbolisme supposés ne doivent nous laisser perdre de vue ce point essentiel. *Perceval*, préléudé par Erec et Yvain, n'est ni un mystique ni un ascète (G Cohen), mais reste chevalier (et le roman n'est naturellement non plus, exagération contraire de M Wilmotte, un livre d'amusement sceptique, voltairien). Le roman de *Perceval*, œuvre épique, non didactique, sera donc, avec le héros n° 1, *Perceval*, le premier *Entwicklungsroman*.



ou roman d'éducation, en même temps qu'il sera encoie, avec Gauvain, un autre de ces *Dieuquroman*, de ces romans d'aventures médiévaux. M. Kellermann montre les fortes attaches qui unissent l'action de Perceval à la cour du roi Artus, p. ex. les grandes scènes de cour maquant les écarts de son développement intérieur—comme dans les autres romans de Chrétien (de là des inférences sur une grande scène finale à la cour qui nous manque dans le fragment conservé). Chrétien, bien entendu, en vrai épique "objectif," met en action (sans nous donner de programme ni de théorie) le développement de son héros: il subordonne l'éclaircissement du lecteur à sa tension (*Spannung*), p. ex. dans la mention si tardive du nom du protagoniste. Le caractère du héros ne dirige pas l'action, mais est plutôt explicité par elle: il n'y a donc de 'psychologie' que subordonnée à la volonté électorice de Dieu. Chrétien nous donne des 'aventures' se succédant dont nous ne devons chercher le fil conducteur qu' "après coup," en rebroussant chemin pour ainsi dire: la volonté de la Providence devient claire quand à la fin nous pouvons mesurer le chemin parcouru par Perceval, qui n'est clair dès l'abord ni à lui ni à nous. Les 'motivations' du poète ont donc plusieurs 'plans' (*Schichten*), selon que nous voulons comprendre la trame extérieure et accidentelle du récit ou ses raisons éthico-religieuses plus profondes. Perceval arrive par hasard au manoir du *graal* où il ne prononce pas les questions que la situation semble requérir—mais pour le poète ce hasard n'en est pas un: il était élu pour délivrer le vieux roi, mais la faute inexpriée (son manque de cœur vis-à-vis de sa mère, morte depuis de chagrin) lui lie la langue. Les valeurs morales qui animent les deux protagonistes sont au fond en harmonie avec le triptyque médiéval du *utile*, *honestum* et du *summum bonum*. Gauvain arrive aux deux premiers, Perceval seul conquiert le dernier. Dans un dernier chapitre, moins original, je crois, M. Kellermann esquisse son opinion, moins sur "le sens du *graal*" (puisque aussi bien nous n'en savons pas beaucoup d'après l'état du fragment), que sur la genèse du roman par une synthèse due à Chrétien, d'un 'conte du *nielot*,' d'un roman arthurien et d'une légende chrétienne. L'harmonisation de ces éléments aboutit à un 'roman à évolution' courtois, à base de la conception augustinienne de la *felix culpa*, incarnée dans Perceval. Robert de Boron a insisté bien davantage sur le côté théologique et symbolique et, probablement, s'est servi de Chrétien; Wolfram a créé un personnage plus tragique, moins classiquement mesuré que le héros de Chrétien, puisque ne se sachant pas pécheur et révolté contre un Dieu qu'il doit croire injuste.

#### Remarques

p. 35 le passage d'Erec vv. 13-14 (*et trest d'une bone aventure une mout bele conjointure*) me semble mieux interprété par M. Nitzsche (que Kellermann ne mentionne pas), *Rom. XLIV*, p. 16.

p 87 *les tant que (lors s'esleisse parmi le bois tant con cele trace li dure, tant que il vit par aventure une pucele soz un chesne)*, si fréquents dans le *Perceval*, sont pour notre auteur un procédé de style inherent à la technique de l' 'aventure' le héros est conduit soi disant *par aventure*, mais en verite par une nécessité épique, à un lieu où d'après le plan de l'œuvre un événement important doit arriver. D'autre part, Mlle A Hachez montre dans un article "Consecutive Clauses in OF," qui paraîtra sous peu, que ce type de phrases introduites par *tant que* est un cliché de l'ancienne littérature épique, qui tend à représenter toute action (comme tout héros) dans le cadre d'un moule (*pattern*) idéal (c'est l'idée que M Kellermann énonce à la p 136 "Die Lebensanschauung des hochmittelalterlichen Dichters ist vielmehr auf feste Normen hin ausgerichtet") Au lieu de *tant que* on pourrait substituer le *si bien que* de La Fontaine annonçant une étape ultérieure d'un devenir le héros ne peut qu'accomplir tout l'humainement possible, il doit aller aussi loin que *cele trace li dure, tant qu'il arrive* au lieu à lui prédestiné, et le conteur, montrant ici comme en d'autres occasions le bout de l'oreille, se réjouit, avec Chrétien ou La Fontaine, de ce développement idéal (chez La Fontaine quelquefois nonisé)

p 138 la conception de l' 'aventure' chez Chrétien aurait gagné en relief historique si M Kellermann l'avait comparée à celle de Marie de France, v Elena Eberwein, "Zum Problem der mittelalterlichen Existenz" (Bonn 1932)

p 139 sur le problème *puer senex* cf maintenant E R Curtius, *ZRP* 1938

p 142 *ne sai l'œuvre asomer* n'est pas tellement en contradiction avec *n'an tot le monde n'a maçon qui miraux devisast la façon del chastel* Ce sont deux formules toutes faites, typiques et typisantes, du panegyrisme médiéval

p 164 une des idées les plus malheureuses qui aient été lancées dans le domaine médiéval est l'idée, que notre auteur a faite sienne, de M Fianz, sur la "reflektierte Handlung" dans la littérature narrative du moyen âge français, censée tendre à un effet, une "pose" plus ou moins théâtrale et calculée, "réfléchie" cette même idée a produit des erreurs néfastes dans le travail, d'ailleurs méritoire, de Mlle Ruth Hoppe sur les "gestes" dans le *Roland* si un héros médiéval fait un geste ou accomplit une action impressionnante, il n'est pas encore dit que *ce personnage* ait calculé lui-même l'impression produite—c'est tout simplement l'auteur qui a su créer d'une façon impressionnante

p 165 je m'étonne que M Kellermann n'ait vu que de la vaine apparence ("Schein") dans les passages où la gloire du héros est la 'sanction de la prouesse' On sait de reste combien la *fama* était inhérente à la conception de l'honneur chez les scolastiques et que M Castro a prouvé la survivance de ce code d'honneur, pour nous assez extérieur, dans la comedia du *siglo de oro* espagnol A ajouter le locus communis du panegyrique médiéval de la *bonne chanson* que tout héros brigue

p 199 seq je ne vois pas de rapport entre la prière égrenant les *noms de Dieu* que murmure l'ermite, et la prière épique à récapitulations de cas où Dieu a sauvé des hommes ou accompli des miracles Là il y a vraiment une prière de magicien qui veut exorciser, ici une prière dont au moins le schéma est orthodoxe (biblique) D'ailleurs les *noms de Dieu* sont aussi mentionnés dans la chanson de geste (*Roland*) et seront donc un reste de 'religion populaire' dans le *Perceval*

p 204 je ne comprends pas la sanction, par notre auteur, de cette leçon faite au moyen âge par M Winkler au sujet du prétendu manque de confiance dans les forces morales de l'individu ("Er [le poète médiéval] ebnete seinem Publikum *allen* willfährig den Weg der Überkompensation er nahm dem Erlebnis den Reiz der Leistung") et je ne puis adhérer à la caractérisation citée de Bernard de Clairvaux "der in Kampfsinn und

Eigen-sinn wie *im rotlichen Blondhaar und in der leuchtenden Parzival haut* [c'est moi qui souligne] das Erbe seiner germanischen Ahnen bewahrte"—sommes nous dans un *Rassenamt* hitlerien? Et, vaille que vaille, les deux traits physiques cites ne seraient ils pas plus appropriés à la description physique—d'un juif polonais?

p 218 sur *graal*, d'abord appellatif, puis nom propre cf mes constatations sur la labilité qui règne au moyen âge entre ces deux classes grammaticales (la *trotaconventos* de l'archiprêtre de Hita, v *Ztschr* 1934, p 263, et la *beatrice* du Dante, *Trav sém d'Istanbul* I, p 162)

p 226 à l'encontre de ce que l'auteur avait avancé avant, il semble admettre que Chretien ait nommé son roman, non *Perceval*, mais *roman du Graal*

LEO SPITZER

---

*A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709.* By HENRIETTA C BARTLETT and ALFRED W POLLARD Revised and Extended by HENRIETTA C BARTLETT. New Haven Yale University Press, 1939 Pp. v + 165 \$10 00.

The twenty-three years since 1916, when Miss Bartlett and Dr Pollard first published their *Census*, have wrought a greater change in the ownership of rare books than any other like period in the history of book collecting. The conditions brought about by the war of 1914-18 have resulted in the dispersal of many private collections and the formation of new collections both private and public. It is therefore not surprising that Miss Bartlett is now able to add extensively to the recorded number of Shakespeare quartos. That she has raised the number from 875 to 1206 is an indication of the vigor and thoroughness of her recent investigations.

Of the seven largest collections of Shakespeare quartos, three—the British Museum (101), Trinity College Cambridge (51), and the New York Public Library (34)—have given but little trouble in the revision, for they were for the most part formed before 1916. A comparison of the holdings, in 1916 and in 1939, of the other four great collections reveals their notable growth during that period. Folger from 124 to 205, Huntington from 87 to 125, Bodleian from 59 to 77, Harvard from 2 to 57.

In addition to recording newly-discovered quartos and changes of ownership since 1916, Miss Bartlett has been able personally to examine many copies previously inaccessible and hence known to her only through sale catalogues or descriptions communicated to her by owners or librarians—notably the Crichton-Stuart and the Folger copies. This has now enabled her not only to describe these copies fully and accurately, but also correctly to allocate to the right edition many copies previously so imperfectly described as to make it impossible to determine to which edition they belonged. She has, it may be added, thoroughly checked all of her old descriptions and, in the relatively few cases in which it was necessary, corrected and expanded them, especially with respect to provenance.

It is regrettable that such a careful and valuable revision should be marred by Miss Bartlett's failure at several points to achieve a completeness not at all beyond her reach. In her brief introduction she observes that the first edition of the *Census* omitted *The First Part of the Contention* (2 *Henry VI*) and *The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of York* (3 *Henry VI*) because they were then generally believed to be non-Shakespearian, and that though now regarded as Shakespeare's own work they are yet omitted in the revision. The omission again of *Pericles* she excuses because of Lee's census—now thirty-four years old. Less important but quite as hard to understand is her failure to distinguish between the three 1703 editions of *Hamlet*, for the existence and correct order of which she cites (pp. 14-15) H. N. Paul in *MLN*, "June 6, 1934" (*read* xlix (1934), 369-75). It is quite true, as Miss Bartlett points out, that the title-pages can scarcely be distinguished, but she herself cites textual variants sufficient to have enabled any owner or librarian to determine for her to which edition or editions his copies belong. Lastly, the omission of the excellent introduction to the first edition of the *Census*, which would have required little revision, will be felt as a heavy loss by those who do not possess that earlier edition. This especially deserves mention in view of the somewhat misleading quotation, on the dust wrapper of the new edition, of a review of the edition of 1916 which calls particular attention to the introduction.

GILES E. DAWSON

*Folger Shakespeare Library*

*Samuel Taylor Coleridge A Biographical Study.* By E. K. CHAMBERS. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1938 and 1939. Pp. xvi + 373. \$7.00.

*Organic Unity in Coleridge.* By GORDON MCKENZIE. Berkeley. University of California Press, 1939. \$1.00. (University of California Publications in English, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 1-108.)

When, in 1934, Sir Edmund Chambers published a paper entitled "Some Dates in Coleridge's *Annus Mirabilis*" his readers did not suspect the extensiveness of his journey into romantic fields. Surprise and curiosity greeted the announcement, four years later, that he was writing a complete life of Coleridge. Curiosity about the temporary shift of interests may persist, but surprise has given place to a high degree of satisfaction with the biography.

Unquestionably we have here a book that will prove indispensable

as a reliable and sorely needed work of ready reference. Turning to any period of Coleridge's life we may choose, we find a compact narrative based largely on his own works and letters, and on pertinent letters, diaries and miscellaneous accounts written by his contemporaries. Sir Edmund has availed himself of innumerable pieces of detailed research made by Coleridge scholars, ancient and modern, and has included full references to these in his foot-notes. The notes, in fact, do much more than substantiate his narrative, they furnish, as the publishers indicate, admirable bibliographies for further reading on special topics. The table of references to printed sources might well have been supplemented by a descriptive list of manuscripts referred to from time to time, but the use made of manuscript materials is so slight that the omission is not a serious one.

A remarkably skilful synthesis of heterogeneous evidence, keenly evaluated, is what Sir Edmund has given us. The table of contents may be slightly misleading; chapter headings such as "Bread and Cheese," "The Journalist," and "On the Wing" suggest more interpretation than the book actually offers, and something of the pleasant discursiveness of Lawrence Hanson's biography rather than the business-like continuity of this.

Occasionally the author has argued some moot question at length and given his own judgment on the matter. For example, he has included a four-page account of critical controversies over the dating of "Kubla Khan," carefully examining the evidence and making a good case for his own conclusion that the poem was probably composed in October, 1797, very possibly between the 12th and the 14th. Such passages are rare, but the same sort of close study and reasoning has gone into biographical details that are not elaborated at length.

With all its compactness, the book is thoroughly interesting reading for any one who wants an up-to-date account of the facts of Coleridge's life and a picture of the man in many of his ordinary relationships. Naturally, no one would look to it for an idealization of the poet-philosopher. Moreover, no one should expect to find in it a thorough history of Coleridge's intellectual development. Such a study as Earl Griggs's comparison of the 1809 and 1818 editions of "The Friend," with its deductions as to changes in Coleridge's intellectual interests, is foreign to Sir Edmund's methods, though he does make mention of some of the obvious differences between the two versions. Sir Edmund gives the impression, in fact, of having little interest in Coleridge's prose, or in the general run of his poetry, except as these offer strictly biographical material. His inclusion, in an appendix, of eight hitherto unpublished letters is in line with the concern for detailed biographical evidence that is shown throughout.

It would be difficult to find a study of Coleridge more directly antithetical to Sir Edmund Chambers' than the monograph "Or-

ganic Unity in Coleridge" by Gordon McKenzie of the University of California. In the latter book biography is ignored when it does not bear obviously on the conflict between the "heart" and the "head" that supposedly conditioned Coleridge's critical method, chronology is practically ignored, the bibliography is limited. It is a very general, but thoughtful, study of an abstract philosophical principle, showing its importance in Coleridge's system and technique of criticism. The present reviewer, remembering her own far inferior attempt to expound Coleridge's critical use of the principle of the reconciliation of opposites, hesitates to make any adverse criticisms, but it must be said that work recently done in the history of ideas and in detailed Coleridge scholarship makes McKenzie's method and his results seem rather less valuable than would have been the case a few years ago. This is not to deny the importance of the birds-eye view that he gives or of many very illuminating passages. The book is well worth the reading of all serious students of Coleridge's criticism.

McKenzie says that it apparently did not occur to Coleridge that the principle of organic unity and that of the reconciliation of opposites were in conflict, or that "although both were idealistic, formed of the same stuff, they represented different systems of thought." I believe that Coleridge's "Hints toward the Formation of a more Comprehensive Theory of Life," and especially a MS fragment apparently designed for this essay and then discarded (cf *MLN*, May, 1932), showed him in the process of wrestling with the two principles and trying to reconcile them. The fact that he was not more obviously troubled by the conflict may perhaps be explained by his belief that new definitions of organic life were paving the way for a resolution. The question is an important one, and I am glad that it has been raised in this monograph.

ALICE D. SNYDER

*Vassar College*

---

*Pride and Passion, Robert Burns 1759-1796.* By DELANCY FERGUSON. New York Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xxii + 321. \$3.00

Free from the acute embarrassment characteristic of so many of his predecessors, gifted with a pungent style, and writing under a plan which allows him to omit the trivial and to emphasize Burns' leading qualities and his relation to his time, Professor Ferguson takes his place in the very select circle of those who have tried to present Burns fully and to present him whole. And he succeeds the better in that he knows the more, for while the book is brisk and popular, and necessarily summary in its method, its sound and

comprehensive scholarship cannot be too strongly emphasized. For instance, in the chapter on Women, Professor Ferguson gives the first complete and reasonably weighted account of Burns' heroines and of the girl he finally married. A good example of the "pith o' sense" in this chapter is the remark on Highland Mary, "In view of the social attitude of the Ayrshire peasantry the question of whether or not Mary was technically chaste is both metaphysical and irrelevant." Similarly *Pride and Passion* has done a great service in shifting emphasis from the evil done Burns by his much publicized tavern-companions, to the much more serious damage done him by well-intentioned and well-born acquaintances. In fact, on the whole matter of Burns' dissipations, Professor Ferguson speaks shrewdly when he says, "If Burns dissipated heavily he managed somehow to do it without heavy expenditure, an art few people have learned."

Throughout the book one is continually struck by its excellent good sense and balance. Despite his great charm, Burns' "inverted snobbery" certainly antagonized people who could have made life easier for him. From youth his pride, his unruly passions, his "skinless sensibility," his desire to shine and to shock got him into far more trouble than his dissipation. But too seldom does a biographer emphasize as equally important Burns' sense of responsibility to his family (his brother and sisters and mother, as well as his wife and children), his loyalty to his friends, his unfailing honesty and forthrightness, his industry, his patriotism both political and literary. Far too often Burns' peasanthood is mentioned and then forgot, but his biographer must ever remember, as does Professor Ferguson, that he "was twenty-six before he ever entered the home of a woman sufficiently well-to-do to have carpets on the floor." Finally, in addition to shrewd analysis of character, the work is notable for its suggestive criticism, such as the remark that Burns developed the dramatic lyric fifty years before Browning.

While not a complete life, *Pride and Passion* is an eminently readable full length portrait, accurate in detail and skilful in shading, of a man who has been markedly unfortunate in his biographers. It makes clear what Burns felt when he predicted a century's passage would see him better thought of than in his own time, for, "It is not so much that he was conspicuously sinful as that he sinned conspicuously." He was, as Andrew Lang sagely remarked, "quite good enough as he is."

ROBERT T. FITZHUGH

University of Maryland

---

*The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* Edited by RALPH L RUSK  
New York Columbia University Press, 1939 6 volumes  
\$30 00

All serious students of American literature are profoundly indebted to Professor Rusk and the Columbia University Press for a monumental collection of Emerson's letters. They occupy six volumes, beautifully printed and bound, amounting to 3,200 well-filled pages. A total of 4,374 letters are now accounted for: 2,313 never printed before, 271 hitherto printed only in part, 509 listed because already available in print, and 1,281 listed because known to have been written but not accessible. This is indeed a vast supplement to the collections previously made by E W Emerson, Charles Eliot Norton, and others. One might wish that the text of all the previously known and the newly known letters had been published in an inclusive work, partly for convenience of use and partly because of "O P" difficulties in the case of existing collections, though the expense of publishing would have been much greater. As it is, however, we have an enormous addition to the corpus of Emerson's writings. There were 12 volumes in the standard *Works*, there were 10 in the *Journals*, and we now have 6 large volumes of *Letters* ranging from the year in which Washington was captured by the British to the year in which Chester A. Arthur became President. In view of the growing tendency to recognize in Emerson the greatest of American writers, this is happy and justified abundance.

In comparison with all previous editors Professor Rusk is meticulously expert. He prepared a literal text with the aid of photostatic reproductions of virtually all the manuscripts which enabled him to check and recheck freely. The photostats will be preserved in the Columbia University Library and thus be accessible for verification of the text in case the original letters are destroyed or lost. The text is heavily annotated, the notes indicating, among other things, the ownership of all manuscripts and the works in which already printed texts are to be found. The notes also contain explanatory quotations from hundreds of letters addressed to Emerson. The index to the set amounts to 286 pages printed in double-column. As an indefatigably careful scholar Professor Rusk well deserves the confidence placed in him by the Ralph Waldo Emerson Memorial Association, which possesses the most important collection of the original letters.

The value of the new materials it would be premature to assess now. Professor Rusk has suggested it in his attractively-written Introduction, but many other scholars will have to use the new fund placed at their disposal before its total significance will be clear. Suffice it to indicate here some of the things that can be done with



the letters First, one may find in them fresh evidence of the nature of Emerson's personality—of his humor, his courtesy, his capacity for anger, the real coldness and real warmth of his temperament, to mention qualities touched upon by his editor, who expresses the judgment that the letters are "the most satisfactory record of the personality of Emerson" which we possess Then, one may find new biographical details,—of his actions, his comings and goings, his relations with many people,—details which will doubtless take their place in the biography of Emerson upon which Professor Rusk is now engaged Again, one may find new light upon Emerson's works, upon their genesis, the influences upon them, and the like. And again, one may study more closely than has hitherto been possible the growth of his mind—his changing interests and opinions, his response to his experience of life and books

It would be too much to say that we have in these letters the "true" Emerson, Emerson off his guard, for he was never really off his guard But he is less calculating here than in his works, less self-conscious than in his journals A large proportion of the new letters are addressed to members of his family, most notably those to his older brother William (which cover more than half a century), to Aunt Mary Moody, to Lidian Emerson and to his children. Though even here one must read between the lines, they bring us close to the Emerson who lived in the flesh

NORMAN FOERSTER

University of Iowa

---

*Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater* By FEDERICO OLIVERO Turin Società Editrice Internazionale, 1939 Pp. 388

This study is written against a background, literary, philosophic, and religious, which is overwhelming Clarity of argument often disappears behind plurality of reference, and parallels are found in all ages and climes The first chapter contains a comparison between Pater and Job, the book ends with quotations from Rilke The emphasis is somewhat distorted by Professor Olivero's particular interests Francis Thompson, Poe, Carlyle, Dante, loom large Pater's religious thought is made too positive, his aesthetic thought becomes a pendant, a postscript.

The central argument itself shows Pater in an unusual light He, no less than his hero Marius, possesses an *anima naturaliter Christiana*, and art for him becomes, like Roman Catholic ritual, a means toward apprehending more fully a mystical Christian faith In a sense this shift in emphasis is salutary Olivero's chapter on Pater's ascetic austerity is one of the best in the book But the

suggested conclusion that Pater was a Christian believer can be over-simplified. Desire to believe is not the same as belief. Nor does the career of Marius leave a single, simple effect of the triumph of Christianity. "The Epicurean" is the protagonist, and Cornelius merely his inspiring Christian friend. Pater is nothing if not a master of ambiguity and nuance: he remains in the "gray, austere evening" he loves, and does not step into the full light of faith.

Olivero handles his argument topically, with important chapters on the spell which ritualism would inevitably cast upon Pater, on the spiritual refinement Pater gives to pagan philosophies, on his never-ending self-portraiture, on his sensitive use of symbolic landscapes, on his ceaseless dwelling upon suffering, sorrow, and death. There are finely turned incidental remarks.

The book, nevertheless, is not wholly satisfactory, because it often tries to retrace through intelligence a meaning which depends upon indeterminate emotion. On the other hand, it is not sufficiently analytical, the focus is not sharp, the argument is not progressive; significant points are lost among details. It is a leisurely re-assembling, under arbitrary categories, of *dissecta membra* from Pater's works, as if glass fragments of medieval cathedral windows were to be collected in boxes according to reds and blues. Our pleasure comes from glints of remembered colors, but the original patterns and artifice have been destroyed. The fundamental purpose of the book, however, and its extensive scope, are admirable, for Pater has too long been considered a dilettante.

Princeton, New Jersey

DONALD A. STAUFFER

*The Personal Heresy, a controversy* By E. M. W. TILLYARD and C. S. LEWIS. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 150. \$2.00.

The personal heresy is the doctrine that poetry expresses primarily the "personality" of the poet and that what we ought to derive from the reading of poems is a deeper acquaintance with their authors. The fighting words in this doctrine are of course "primarily" and "personality" for no one would disagree with the theory that along with other things some degree or measure of a man's personality is expressed. However colorless a verbal expression may be, its very lack of color is expressive of a personality. As the French philosopher, M. Brunschvicg, has said, the way a man orders a meal tells you something of his soul. The difficulty arises when a certain emphasis is put upon the personal expression.

Both authors engage in a controversy which has a double interest, the interest in the subject matter itself and the interest in the

dramatic development of that subject matter. The controversy was real, not cooked up for the occasion, and both Messrs. Tillyard and Lewis are serious readers of poetry and skilled expositors of ideas. That they land in eventual disagreement on the major issue and harmony on the minors, that they succeed in making clearer certain terms and in indicating obscurities where the ordinary speaker would see only brilliance, must be expected from so profound a debate.

If a reviewer may engage in argument with the authors, it may be worth while suggesting that this is a good proof of the "multivalence" of works of art. Poems tell stories, give emotional intensity to ideas, convey sensations from one man to another and express personalities. There is moreover value in all. The trouble with "The Personal Heresy" is inherent in the *a priori* method of arguing from verbal formulas instead of from history. If one says, Poems are made of words, words express thoughts, therefore poems express thoughts, one has a perfect argument. Likewise, if one says, Poems express thoughts, thoughts express personalities, therefore poems express personalities. We have no revelation to tell us whether thoughts are more important than personalities, at times they have been esteemed very highly, at other times, they have been esteemed less highly. Mr. Tillyard and Mr. Lewis would appear to have a temperamental division on this point. History shows that they are not unique in this division. Is it not possible that—among other things—poems are thoughts expressed by personalities? Is it not moreover possible that the peculiar value of a poem is precisely the curious combination of the valuable thought and the valuable personality?

GEORGE BOAS

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Tom Brown of Facetious Memory: Grub Street in the Age of Dryden.* By BENJAMIN BOYCE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 216. \$2.50.

This scholarly, readable book is important for two reasons. On the one hand, it provides the first accurate, full-length account of one of the most amusing, if also one of the most disreputable, contemporaries of Dryden, and on the other, it illuminates the history of Grub Street during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, when for the first time professional men of letters found it possible to earn a living without recourse either to patrons or to the stage. Tom Brown, satirist, journalist, translator, pamphleteer, and poet, was the "foremost hackney author" of this

period. He never had a patron and he never wrote any plays, but he knew what the reading public wanted and managed to support himself by his pen for sixteen years, from 1688 to 1704. He was a scurrilous fellow, in many ways,—witty, but also quarrelsome, coarse, and debauched. These are the qualities for which he is remembered today, thanks to the damnation heaped upon his memory by succeeding writers who are now more read than he. But the observant author of such satires as *Amusements Serious and Comical* and *Letters from the Dead to the Living* cannot have been utterly despicable, and Professor Boyce, without minimizing Brown's notorious deficiencies, does a service to scholarship by calling attention also to the solidity of his learning, the independence of his character, and the integrity of his political and religious principles. Whatever else may be alleged against him, Brown was neither a trimmer nor a turncoat.

Professor Boyce analyzes the sources, English and European, of many of Brown's works, and traces Brown's considerable influence on such writers as Addison, Swift, Fielding, Sterne, and even Lamb. His bibliography of Brown's works is one of the most useful features of his book. Brown often wrote anonymously or in collaboration with others, and many titles have been mistakenly attributed to him. Hence to have brought order out of the chaos of Brown's bibliography is no minor achievement. Two trifling additions to Professor Boyce's list of miscellanies are here suggested. *The Dverting Post*, 1704, contains an epigram on Queen Anne ascribed to Brown. Other extant editions of *The Pleasant Musical Companion* (Boyce No. 3, pp. 189-90) appeared in 1687, 1709, and 1724.

CYRUS L. DAY

*The University of Delaware*

---

*Rehabilitations and other essays* By C. S. LEWIS. London [and New York] Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. x + 197. \$2.50

In *Rehabilitations*, Mr. C. S. Lewis devotes nine essays to the defense of poets, programs and points of view which are well worth discussion even though the value of the book is less in the points made than in the impulses toward dissent it arouses in the reader.

In the defense of Shelley as against Dryden, Mr. T. S. Eliot is the peg on whom Mr. Lewis hangs his argument and—some may think—himself by the statement: "When Mr. Eliot offers up Shelley as a sacrifice to the fame of Dryden it is time to call a halt." If Mr. Eliot had done anything of the sort many a reader might cheer the champion. The fact is that in Mr. Eliot's Dryden

papers<sup>1</sup> I find only two references to Shelley. The first is in the *Homage*,<sup>2</sup> where six lines by Dryden, which are not in the *Oxford Book of English Verse*, are compared with six by Shelley which are in the book. Mr. Eliot's gesture which is to be halted is "we might defy any one to show us that the second is superior in intrinsic poetic merit." Mr. Eliot's second reference is a comparison between Shelley and Shakespeare.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Lewis' main argument begins no more auspiciously than the supposed occasion for it. He will, he says, "maintain that Shelley is to be regarded . . . as a more masterly, a more sufficient and indeed a more *classical* [this emphasis is not mine] poet than Dryden." No one can object to this point of view as long as the word "classical" retains its present flexibility, but Mr. Lewis omits no opportunities. His argument is. If anyone who has read Sophocles, Virgil, Racine or Milton thinks Pope is a classicist we may "dismiss him as a block-head." Therefore Dryden is not a classicist and thus—though the logic seems strained—Shelley is a better classicist (pp 4-5). It is these irrelevancies of judgment which help to make Mr. Lewis a pleasant summer companion and a dangerous guide.

Two essays defend the Oxford school of English Studies. The second goes over the familiar ground of what are we to do about liberal education in a society which requires technical training. The first defends the three papers required in the literary course at Oxford. These are on Modern English "which deals mainly with the history of meaning," on Anglo-Saxon texts and on Middle English texts. Because English students, like American students, are seldom able to understand what they read, the two sentences which follow are heartening: "I am told that there are critics of Chaucer who have . . . built up formidable superstructures on a purely intuitive and sometimes erroneous conception of their author's meaning" (p. 62), "Again and again curious statements in the essays of our pupils can be traced back to an original failure to make out the sense of Milton or Johnson or Coleridge." The defense of papers on Old and Middle English texts is that they are not philological. Their value is in the fact that poetry in Old English or French or Mediaeval Latin—though the latter texts "are hard to translate" (p. 71) are closer to Modern English than the poetry of Greece and Rome. The Graeco-Latin contribution is matter, the Old English contribution is inspiration.

The defense of William Morris is that a critical revolution "may yet embarrass these scattered and inoffensive readers with the

<sup>1</sup> *Homage to John Dryden*, published by Leonard and Virginia Woolf at the Hogarth Press, London, 1924, *Selected Essays*, Harcourt, Brace, New York, 1932 (I think that the pagination in the English edition differs slightly), and *John Dryden, the poet, the dramatist, the critic, three essays*, New York, Holiday, 1932.

<sup>2</sup> American edition of *Selected Essays*, p. 265.

<sup>3</sup> *John Dryden*, p. 36.

discovery of what they regard as . . . perhaps a shamefaced indulgence has all along been a gratifying proof of their penetration and even contemporaneity" (p. 38). The Union Catalog of the Library of Congress has 387 entries for Morris, indicating that he has been printed in whole or in part on an average of 46 times each year since 1866, and 17 of these appeared in the last nine years. The "scattered and shamefaced readers" seem to be numerous. Other essays in the collection are on popular literature, Christianity and Literature and a semantic nightmare.

Mr. Lewis wears his erudition gravely and though the horses he beats are, for the most part, dead, it is doubtless worth while to tap them occasionally when English societies meet lest they should astonish us by coming to life.

R. D. JAMESON

*Library of Congress*

## BRIEF MENTION

*The Literature of the English Bible* By WILBUR OWEN SYPHERD  
New York Oxford University Press, 1938 Pp. 230 \$2.00  
Once more the Bible has come into its own. Succeeding such well-known works as those of Moulton, Sanders and Kent, Fowler, McFadyen, Mulenberg, and Gardiner, Professor Sypherd of the University of Delaware presents an account of the origin and composition of the English Bible closing with eight appendices essential for the understanding of much about Holy Scriptures. The Introduction treats the English Bible issued in 1611, the Composition of the Biblical Books, Manuscript Copies and Transmission of Scriptures, English Translations of Separate Biblical Books, and the Bible as a whole. Reference is made to the Douay Version of the Catholic Church but none to the Jewish Version called "The Holy Scriptures," published by the Jewish Publication Society of America in 1917 and certainly worthy of notice. That our author is greatly influenced by the so-called "Higher Criticism," is seen by his attention paid to the historical background, the various sources of the material, and the literary form of each of the writings of the Hebrew Canon, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the New Testament. Particularly interesting and illuminating is the characterization of the prophets in Israel, the explanation of Hebrew poetry with suitable illustrations, the indication of propagandistic writings, the delineation of the New Testament thought as differentiated from the Old Testament philosophy, and the assignment of reason why Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical writings were excluded from the Canons. Professor Sypherd has given us a valuable introduction to

Scriptures, presenting his subject-matter in a scholarly, and, at the same time, popular manner. His work deserves to have a place among the text-books used not only in the departments of English, but also in the departments of Sacred Literature, at colleges and universities.

WILLIAM ROSENAU

---

*Rossetti's Sister Helen*. Edited by JANET CAMP TROXELL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 95. \$5.00. Rossetti's 'Sister Helen' is, like 'The Blessed Damsel,' a conspicuous example of a poet's continual revision, and in this edition Mrs. Troxell has collected the various readings of fifteen different 'sources,' ranging from the earliest print (in *The Dusseldorf Artist's Album*) in 1854 to the *Poems* of 1881, and including a series of proof copies and published editions with Rossetti's manuscript corrections and alterations. Instead of a formal collation based on the final version, the editor has printed in order the first form of each stanza (usually from *The Dusseldorf Artist's Album*), the stanza as it appears in the manuscript in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, and as it appears in the proofs which Rossetti had at Penkill Castle in August 1869, and then to these versions has added in notes the intermediate or subsequent changes. This somewhat unusual method has the advantage of permitting a reader who is not expert in interpreting formal collations to follow Rossetti's alterations step by step, and it provides, of course, the materials for those who prefer to make their own apparatus. "The principal value of this study," says Mrs. Troxell truly, "lies in the revelation of exactly when Rossetti made the changes that we know, and the disclosure of the fact that he made others that did not survive long enough to appear in any regular edition." Besides this the volume is handsomely printed and illustrated with plates from the *Dusseldorf Album* and the proofs showing Rossetti's alterations.

Duke University

P. F. BAUM

---

*Ben Jonson (A Concise Bibliography)*. By SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM. *Elizabethan Bibliographies*, No. 2. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1938. Pp. viii + 152. \$5.00. Dr. Tannenbaum's *Elizabethan Bibliographies* are quarries of useful references, but they are not easy to use. Over half the items in this bibliography are lumped together under "Biography and Commentary," alphabetically arranged by author but without further classification. Thus to find what has been written on *Volpone* or Jonson's epigrams, one has to look through 72 pages of bibliography. A reference work should at least separate biography from

criticism, and general criticism from comment limited to a particular work. The section "Autographs and Manuscripts" is not a complete guide to Jonson's autographs, since it mentions only two of Jonson's autograph letters and none of his signatures at the Public Record Office. But it makes several additions to Herford and Simpson's list of "Books in Jonson's Library," including copies of Drayton's *Poly-Olbrion* and *Battle of Agincourt*. The bibliography performs good service in calling attention to unpublished theses preserved in the libraries of American universities, and in furnishing a list of musical settings to Jonson's songs.

*University of Wisconsin*

MARK ECCLES

*Elizabethan and Seventeenth-Century Lyrics*. Selected and edited by MATTHEW W. BLACK. Chicago [etc.] J. B. Lippincott Company, 1938. Pp. xii + 624. \$4.00. The 580 pieces in this admirably printed but heavy volume are derived from Professor Schelling's *Elizabethan Lyrics* and *Seventeenth Century Lyrics* with the omission of over 100 and the addition of 225 poems. The arrangement is a compromise, being in the main chronological but in part according to subject-matter or form or type or provenience. Thus Wotton's "How happy is he born or taught" is 247 pages earlier than his "You meaner beauties of the night," sonnets are found in four sections besides the one to which they give the name, and Donne's religious pieces are separated from his secular while Herrick's are not. "The Pastoralists," "The Sonneteers," and "Lyrics in Song-books" illustrate the different bases of classification. There are brief notes, a curious bibliography of twelve titles, a chapter on the lyric in general, one on Elizabethan meters, and briefer ones (valuable sometimes for information, sometimes for illumination) prefixed to each of the ten groups into which the poems are divided. The selection could hardly be improved within the allotted space but this space is inadequate for the greatest century and a half of the English lyric, 1557-1700. One misses, for example, Campion's "Rose-cheeked Laura, come," Carew's "He that loves a rosy cheek," Rochester's "I cannot change as others do" and "Absent from thee I languish still."

R. D. H.

*Annual Bibliography of English Language & Literature, Volume XVIII, 1937*. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by MARY S. SERJEANTSON assisted by LESLIE N. BROUGHTON. Cambridge University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 311 + iv. 8s. 6d. (United States Agents. University of Chicago Press). This



admirably arranged and carefully indexed volume, indispensable because of its accuracy and inclusiveness, contains about 5000 items. Unfortunately it reaches us a year and a half after the publication of the first titles listed and, more unfortunately, this is the last volume that Miss Serjeantson will be able to edit. Except for a review of Lewis's *Hope for Poetry*, one looks in vain for the names of Auden, Spender, Day Lewis, or Odette. The number of items appearing under the names of the various writers is of some interest: Borrow, 0, T. Warton, 0, Henry James, 2, Hazlitt, 2, Yeats, 3; Meredith, 4, Joyce, 6, Pope, 10, Byron, 13, Coleridge, 14, Swift, 21, Johnson, 23, Shelley, 26, Kipling, 28, Wordsworth, 30, Milton, 62, Dickens, 62, Shakespeare, 241.

R. D. H.

*Sir David Lyndsay, Poet, and Satirist of the Old Church in Scotland.* By W. MURISON. Cambridge at The University Press; New York The Macmillan Co., 1938. Pp. xiv, 227. \$3.75. The author summarizes his book thus (p. xiii): "the following pages are an attempt to tell something about Lyndsay and his works, and also to indicate and justify his attitude to the old Scottish Church." The first chapter (19 pages) gives us a sketch of Lyndsay's life, the second (55 pages), an account of his poems, the third (five pages), a critical estimate of his poetry. Chapter IV (30 pages) sets forth Lyndsay's charges against the (as yet unreformed) Scottish Church of his day, and chapter V (81 pages) attempts to show, by evidence drawn "not from sources hostile to the Roman Church, but from official records of the Church, from state documents, and from writers loyal to the Church" (p. viii), that Lyndsay's charges were well founded. The book ends with a conclusion (four pages), a bibliography (three pages), a glossary (16 pages), and an index (three pages). It is well printed, well bound, and attractively got up.

K. M.

*Books known to Anglo-Latin writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin (670-804)* By J. D. A. OGILVY. Med. Acad. of America, Studies and Documents No. 2. Cambridge, Mass., 1936. Pp. xxii, 109. \$2.25. This lithoprint is a Harvard doctoral dissertation. Though far from exhaustive, and somewhat careless in execution, it will prove useful to students of the period. The author's modesty disarms criticism, but see the reviews of Raby and Beeson in *MLR* xxxii 464 ff. and *MP* xxxiv 315 ff. The name of the Heathobards is misspelled on p. 47.

K. M.

*Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters Palace of Pleasure* By JOSEF RATH Leipzig Robert Noske, 1936 Pp viii, 167 RM 5 This volume is No 3 in the monograph series "Aus Schrifttum und Sprache der Angelsachsen," edited by Professors Hittmair and Spindler The author gives to his book the sub-title "Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in England" Neither title nor sub-title, however, makes clear the scope of the work, which comes down to the end of the nineteenth century, and might well have been called simply Boccaccio in English Literature, even though the drama (except for Shakespeare's *Troilus*) is left out The period from Chaucer to Painter is considered on pp 7 to 113, the next section, pp. 114 to 135, takes up Italian *novelle* in English literature from 1567 to 1620, this is followed by a section, pp 136 to 154, on Boccaccio in English literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries The work is concluded with an appendix on Latin translations of Boccaccio It will be seen that Rath's book is only a survey of the field As such, it has value, and the author's remarks on this and that (e. g. on the realism of Chaucer, p. 8) are often acute

K M

---

*Englische Fürstenspiegel vom Polycraticus Johannis von Salisbury bis zum Basiliakon Doron König Jakobs I* By W KLEINEKE Halle (Saale) Max Niemeyer, 1937. Pp viii, 223 RM 9 This survey of books of instruction for princes is No 90 of Morsbach's well known monograph series, *Studien zur englischen Philologie* The author casts his net wide, including even the Latin poem on the Battle of Lewes He has packed much into his volume, and has adequately sketched the history of such books of instruction in England from the twelfth to the seventeenth century. Scottish activity in the same field is also considered (see pp 96, 141 f, and 200 ff), though only the *Basiliakon* gets extended treatment.

K. M.

---

*Beowulf*, ed F OLIVERO Torino S Lattes & C, 1937 Pp. cix, 255 L 30 This is a translation into French of Olivero's Italian edition of 1934 (reviewed in *MLN.*, LI, 416) The translator was Camille Monnet Apart from the difference in language, the new edition seems to be identical with the old, thus, the erroneous derivation of *ór* from Latin *hora* reappears on p cxxii The two editions have the same format

K M.

*The Seege of Troye*, A Study by G HOFSTRAND Lund C. W K Gleerups Forlag, 1936 Pp xvi, 205 This volume is the fourth of the newly started series, Lund Studies in English The author gives to it the sub-title, "A study in the intertextual relations of the ME romance the Seege or Batayle of Troye" This study is based primarily on the EETS edition of the romance (vol 172, 1926) by Miss M E Barnicle, although other editions and studies have also been used, especially that of Hibler The author collated the texts of B and H with all four MSS of the *Seege*, his work was thus not wholly dependent on the printed texts His book is divided into ten parts of unequal length (besides introduction and bibliography) In Parts I-VII he systematically studies and compares the readings of the MSS, and establishes a stemma Part VIII takes up literary influences reflected in the text, and Part IX deals with the problem of the dialect of the lost original text. Part X, "some notes on the source question," was written before the publication of the *Excidium Troie* of MS Rawlinson D 893, which, as the author notes (p. xii), "throws new light on the question" This previously unknown work is briefly discussed on pp 202 f Mr. Hofstrand's book is a creditable doctor's dissertation.

K M

---

*Valentine and Orson*, translated from the French by HENRY WATSON. Edited by A. DICKSON EETS, vols 204. New York Oxford Univ Press, 1937 Pp lxiv, 375 \$8 This translation of the sixteenth century is here reprinted from the unique copy of the second edition in the Huntington Library, a surviving fragment of the first edition is also reprinted at the appropriate place in the text, and the 12 pages missing from the second edition have been supplied from the British Museum copy of the third edition The introduction considers briefly the story as such, the French romance, the history of the English text, the translator, the language of the sixteenth century as reflected in the text, the woodcuts of the Huntington volume, and the influence of the work upon Spenser, Shakespeare, Cervantes and Bunyan The text is followed by 13 pages of notes and a glossary of 21 pages The work is concluded with an index of proper names The editor has made himself an authority on this romance, and no better man could have been found to edit Watson's translation This volume will be especially welcome, of course, to students of the sixteenth century, but many others will find it interesting and useful.

K. M.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

**Armour, Richard W and Howes, Raymond F**—Coleridge the talker *Ithaca, New York* Cornell U Press, 1940 Pp xvi + 480 \$4 00

**Browning** —Browning's "Roman murder story" as recorded in a hitherto unknown Italian contemporary manuscript Transl E H Yarrill Introd W O Raymond *Waco, Texas* Baylor U Press, 1939 Pp 47 (Baylor Bulletin, xlii, 4)

**Callahan, J J**—Science of language Vol 11—Word study *Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania* Duquesne U Press, 1939 Pp xvi + 272

**French, J Milton**—Milton in Chancery, new chapters in the lives of the poet and his father *New York* Modern Language Association, 1939 Pp x + 428 [Monograph Series, X]

**Garrod, H W**—Keats (Second edition) *Oxford* Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1939 Pp 155 \$2 00

**Gilbert, Katharine E and Kuhn, H**—A history of esthetics *New York* Macmillan, 1939 Pp xxii + 582 \$4 25

**Gilman, Wilbur E**—Milton's rhetoric studies in his defence of liberty *Columbia, Missouri* U of Mo Press, 1939 Pp 193 \$1 25 (U of Mo Studies, xiv, 3)

**Hayakawa, S Q and Jones, H M**—Oliver Wendell Holmes *New York, etc* American Book Co, 1939 Pp cxxx + 472 (American Writers Series)

**Higby, C P and Schantz, B T**—John Lothrop Motley *New York, etc* American Book Co, 1939 Pp cxii + 482 (American Writers Series)

**Manly, John M and Rickert, Edith**—The text of The Canterbury Tales, studied on the basis of all known manuscripts *Chicago, Illinois* U of Chicago Press, 1940 8 volumes Pp xxiv + 690, viii + 518, x + 537, viii + 536, x + 554, viii + 673, viii + 617, viii + 551 (A Fiftieth Anniversary Publication of the U of Chicago Press)

**Shakespeare**—King Lear, 1608 (Pied Bull Quarto) *London* Shakespeare Assoc and Sidgwick and Jackson, 1939 Pp viii + 84 pp of plates 10 sh 6 d (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 1)

—The Merchant of Venice, 1600 (Hayes Quarto) *London*. Shakespeare Assoc and Sidgwick and Jackson, 1939 Pp viii + 76 pp of plates 10 sh 6 d (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 2)

—The Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602 *London*. Shakespeare Assoc and Sidgwick

and Jackson, 1939 Pp viii + 56 pp of plates 10 sh 6 d (Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, 3)

**Spencer, Hazelton**—The art and life of William Shakespeare *New York* Harcourt, Brace, 1940 Pp xx + 495 \$2 25

**Valency, Maurice J**—The tragedies of Herod and Mariamne *New York* Columbia U Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 304 (Columbia U Studies in Eng and Comp Lit, 145)

**Walpole, Horace**—Correspondence Ed W S Lewis and W H Smith Vols. 38—With Madame du Deffaud, Mlle Sanadon, and Wiart *New Haven, Connecticut*. Yale U Press, 1939 Pp lxxxviii + 407, viii + 497, viii + 439, viii + 502, viii + 461, xiv + 561 \$45 00

**Zimmerman, Jane D (ed.)**—Phonetic transcriptions from "American Speech" (Revised edition) *New York* Columbia U Press, 1939 Pp xii + 83 \$1 60 ["American Speech" Reprints and Monographs, 1]

## GERMAN

**Adams, John Quincy**—Oberon, A Poetical Romance in twelve books Translated from the German of Wieland (1799 1801) Edited with an Introduction and Notes by A B Faust *New York* F S Crofts & Co, 1940 xcn, 340 pp \$3 00

**Eickmann, Walter Theodore**—The semasiological development of the pronominal adverbs of motion in Old High German Abridgement of Thesis *New York* New York Univ 1939 18 pp

**Fuehrer, Sister Mary Rosina**—A Study of the Relation of the Dutch Lancelot and the Flemish Percheval Fragments to the Manuscripts of Chrétien's *Conte Del Graal* Diss [Catholic Univ of America, Studies in German Vol XIV] *Washington, D C* 1939 xi, 163 pp

**Goodloe, Jane F**—In Dichters Lande Erlebtes und Gestaltetes von August Winnig, Ernst Wiechert, Hermann Hesse, Bornies, Freiherrn von Munchhausen Ed with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary *New York* Crofts & Co, 1939 xxii, 201 pp \$1 40

**Heller, Otto, and Leon, Theodore H**—Charles Sealsfield Bibliography of his Writings together with a classified and annotated Catalogue of Literature relating to his works and his life With a Foreword by Henry A Pochmann [Washington Univ Studies, N S, Language and Literature, No 8] *St Louis* 1939 x, 88 pp

**Kramer, Priscilla M**—The Cyclical Method of Composition in Gottfried Keller's *Sungedicht* [New York Univ Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs No 26] *New York* 1939 vii, 318 pp

**Long, O W**—Frederic Henry Hedge, A Cosmopolitan Scholar *Portland, Maine*

The Southworth-Anthoensen Press, 1940  
53 pp

Schaerh, E — Kriminalkommissar Hornle's Erlebnisse Adapted Boston Heath [1940] 93 pp

Scheel, Kathe — Untersuchungen über den Satzbau der niederdeutschen Volkssprache und Kunstprosa Diss Hamburg [Sprache und Schrifttum 2 = Forschungen Hrsg für den Verein für niederdeutsche Sprachforschungen N F Reihe B ] [Neumünster] Wachholtz, 1939 xi, 116 pp M 5

Schiller — Zum 150 Gedenktage von Schillers Antrittsvorlesung Schiller, Idealismus und Tragik Rede von Dr Carl Wesle — Schiller als Dichter der Freiheit Rede von Dr Bruno Bauch [Jenaer akademische Reden H 26] Jena Fischer, 1939 30 pp M 1 60

Walter, Karl — Karl von Lohbauer (1777-1809), Königl Württ Hauptmann und Ritter des Militär-Verdienst Ordens Schicksal eines württembergischen Soldaten und deutschen Dichters während Deutschlands tiefster Erniedrigung Mit 9 Abbildungen [Veröffentlichungen des Archivs d Stadt Stuttgart H 4] Stuttgart Kraus, 1939 35 pp 4° M 1 50

### FRENCH

Berzé, Hugues de — La "Bible" au seigneur de Berzé, éd crit de F Lecoy Paris Droz, 1938 71 pp Fr 20

Cedeyco, Joseph — German Criticism of Anatole France Abstract of Ill diss Urbana 1939 8 pp

Clark, A F B — Jean Racine Cambridge. Harvard U Press, 1939 vi + 354 pp. \$3 50 (Harvard St in Comp Lit, 16)

Hulubei, Alice. — L'Eglogue en Fr au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle (1515-89) Paris Droz, 1938 xxiv + 794 pp Fr 200

— Répertoire des élogues en Fr au XVI<sup>e</sup> s Ibid, 1939 xi + 117 pp Fr 20

Lot, F — Joseph Bédier Paris Droz, 1939 55 pp Fr 12

Marfan, L-A — Venance Dougados, 1763-94, un jeune poète victime de la Révolution Toulouse Privat, 1938 380 pp Fr 30

Micha, A. — La Tradition manuscrite des romans de Chrétien de Troyes Paris. Droz, 1939 402 pp Fr 100

Montchrestien. — Aman, a Critical Ed by G O Server Philadelphia U of Pa Press, 1939 x + 163 pp

Pange, comtesse Jean de — A-G Schlegel et Mme de Staël Diss Paris. Albert, 1939 650 pp

Pure, de — La Prétieuse ou le mystère des ruelles, 3<sup>e</sup> et 4<sup>e</sup> parties, ed E Magne Paris. Droz, 1939 340 pp Fr 30 (Soc des t fr mod)

Ronsard, Œuvres complètes X Ed crit de P Laumonier Paris Droz, 1939 xxxi + 399 pp Fr 40 (Soc des t fr m)

Siciliano, Italo — Le Origini delle Canzoni di gesta Padua A Milani, 1940 221 pp

Sylvain, Suzanne — Le Créole haïtien Port au Prince 1936 180 pp

### ITALIAN

Amelotti, G — Il Leopardi maggiore (Opera postuma), con una appendice sul "Discorso sullo stato presente degli Italiani" e una pref di S E A Fainelli Genova Emilianog degli Orfini, 1939 230 pp L 15

Cian, V — La satira (Dal Medioevo al Pontano) Milano F Vallardi, 1939 xiv + 535 pp leg L 65 (Storia dei Generi letterari)

Cocchiara, G — Problemi di poesia popolare Palermo Palumbo, 1939 154 pp L 15

De Robertis, Giuseppe — Saggi, con una noterella Firenze Le Monnier, 1939 207 pp L 12

Gasparrini Leporace, Tullia — I manoscritti capilupiani della Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma Roma Ist poligr della Stato, 1939 xxiv + 147 pp L 20

Guasti, Cesare — Memorie e studi Pagine scelte da R Nuti Firenze Marzocco, 1939 xi + 369 pp L 15

Mussini, C — Alessandro Tassoni Torino Paravia, 1939 128 pp L 5

Petronio, G — Francesco De Sanctis Torino Paravia, 1939 126 pp L 5

Tenneroni, M. e A. — Jacopone da Todì Roma Rassegna Nazionale, 1939 34 pp L 3 50

Zaccagnini, G — Giuseppe Guasti Pistoia Casa Ed Tariffi, 1939 vii + 207 pp L 12

### SPANISH

Adams, N B, and Place, E B — Lecturas modernas New York Crofts, 1938 viii + 168 pp \$1 20

Arjona, D K. and J H — A Bibliog of Textbooks of Spanish pub in the U S Ann Arbor. Edwards, 1939 (lithotyped)

Azueta, Mariano — Los de abajo, ed J E Englekirk and L B Kiddle New York Crofts, 1939 lviii + 181 pp \$1 40

Espinosa, A. M. — Historia de la literatura española New York Oxford, 1939 xl + 349 pp \$1 80

Garfalo Mesa, M G — Plácido Poeta y Martir Mexico Eds Botas, 1938 205 pp.

Hartsook, J H. — Bequer and Heine a Comparison. Abstract of Ill diss Urbana: 1939. 10 pp

Mitchell, S L — Intermediate Sp Comp New York Longmans, Green, 1938 \$1 50

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LV

APRIL, 1940

Number 4

---

## NOTES ON MIDDLE ENGLISH LYRICS

The English lyrics of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are now becoming better known to students through Carleton Brown's volumes<sup>1</sup> In spite of the great superiority of Brown's texts to those of earlier editors, many difficulties remain, some of the lyrics in Harley 2253 being, indeed, among the most obscure poems in Middle English The following notes, based on a recent re-reading of the poems, are sometimes merely corrections of the definitions of single words, sometimes more elaborate interpretations of difficult passages The Roman numerals refer to Brown's volumes of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries respectively, the Arabic to the poems and lines as numbered by him

XIII, 4 21 *Loates* This is 'looks,' 'appearance,' from ON *lát*, pl 'manners,' *NED*'s *late*, sb 1, not 'deceits,' as glossed With the line 'þine loates weren lasteles,' one may compare the similar phrase in the *Legend of Katharine* 'mid lasteles lates' (J Hall, *Early Middle English* II, 129, 35)

XIII, 5 Line four of the second stanza of the Anglo-Norman version reads 'vie sui atort gete,' but should read 'v [= ou] ie sui atort gete,' i e 'the prison wherein I am wrongfully cast' For the spelling, compare *v* = *ou*, 'where,' in the fourth line of the Anglo-Norman stanza on page 12

XIII, 10 4 *Blench* is 'trick,' an example of *NED*'s *blench*, sb. (cf OE *blencan* 'deceive'), not 'sunshine,' as the glossary has it, comparing *NED*'s *blenk*, sb. 2 'Fair weder ofte him went to rene, an ferliche maket is blench' means 'fair weather often turns to rain and suddenly plays its trick' The phrase *make a blench*, 'play a trick' occurs elsewhere, for example, in *Purity* 1202.

<sup>1</sup> *English Lyrics of the XIIIth Century*, Oxford, 1932, *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*, Oxford, 1924

XIII, 43 94. 'Freo of heorte, of wisdom wilde' Brown defines *wilde* as 'filled,' but this is surely OE (WS) *wielde*, adj., 'powerful,' 'mighty,' and the *NED* actually records the line under the adjective *wield*, together with two Middle English instances from Layamon, who has forms from the corresponding OM *welde*. The same word occurs in 54 21, where Brown finds the adjective *wilde* surprising as applied to Christ, and again in 60 38, 'ase þu art fréo & walt & maucht,' where *wilt*, with unvoicing of the final consonant, does not seem to be glossed.

XIII, 46 B 60 'Ne may no man bu det ageyn' Brown interprets *bu* here as 'be,' and Kemp Malone, in his valuable notes on the lyrics, translates either (a) 'there can be no evil [OE *mān*] in comparison with death' or (b) 'no man can flee, with death as his opponent,' with *bu* from OE *būgan*.<sup>2</sup> I should prefer to consider *bu* a West Midland form of *buy* (cf. the *buye*-, *bue*-forms in the *NED*) and interpret the line as meaning 'No man can redeem (himself) against death.'

XIII, 74 29-30

3of þer lyþ a loket by er ouþer eze  
þat mot wiþ worse be wet for lac of oþer leze

The manuscript has *3ef*, not *3of*, according to G. L. Brook,<sup>3</sup> and Brown notes that the manuscript has *lat* not *lac*. Brown interprets *er* as 'her,' *ouþer* as 'other,' and *loket* as 'locket' in his glossary. Malone interprets *loket* as 'lovelock,' 'curl,' hanging 'by ear or eye'.<sup>4</sup> Adhering to the manuscript reading *lat*, Malone translates 'wet for show or lie,' and considers *with worse*, 'with the devil,' an oath similar to the familiar *with mischance*. Objections to his interpretation of the second line are the definition of *of* as *or*, since the single instance cited from Stratmann-Bradley is probably an error, and the interpretation of *wiþ worse* as referring to the devil, since *worse* meaning the devil is always *þe worse* in Middle English, as in 28 A 28.

The true meaning of *leze* is not Boddeker's 'Auskunftsmittel,' nor Brown's 'protection,' from OE *hlēo*, nor Malone's 'lie,' but 'lye' from OE *lēag*, 'lye,' which was used in a much broader sense in earlier times than at present. The significance of line 30 cannot be grasped without remembering the use of *lye* as a cosmetic and

<sup>2</sup> *ELH*, II (1935), 60

<sup>3</sup> *Medium Aevum* II (1933), 80

<sup>4</sup> *Op cit*, pp. 63-64

dressing for the hair, and the common association of lye with urine in the Middle Ages and long after. A definition from a fifteenth-century vocabulary states the case succinctly '*Locum*, lye or pyse'<sup>5</sup> Urine or chamber-lye was a very familiar kind of lye, and used both for cleaning of all sorts and as a cosmetic. Arnald of Villanova around 1300 recommended as especially beneficial for the eyes washing with one's own urine upon rising in the morning<sup>6</sup> The *NED* cites Holland's translation of the ever popular Pliny to the effect that the 'vrin of a yong Asse fole is supposed to thicken the haire' (II, 324, ed 1601). *Lye* itself is defined as a cosmetic for the hair by the *NED* s v *lye*, sb, c, and Brown correctly defines the word thus in lyric 2 19 'mi brune her is hwit bicume, ich not for hwucche leihe' Ladies had *lye-pots* of silver and gilt for hair-wash, as the *NED*'s quotations show In view of the use of lye as a dressing for the hair, and the use of urine as a common kind of lye, line 30 must mean '[lock] that must be wet with worse or inferior [lye] for lack of other lye,' and the implication is that the worse 'lye' is urine This vulgar interpretation is borne out by the crudity of expression in lines 14 and 23 In fact, the whole point of the poem is this, that the common woman imitates the fashions and apparel of the lady of rank and wealth (see especially lines 8-14), but inevitably betrays by her crude manners and lack of refinement that she is still 'a strompet in rybaudes rewe'<sup>7</sup>

XIII, 75 Brown's text and glossarial explanations of 'Man Must Fight Three Foes' are an improvement over Boddeker's, but much of the poem is still obscure.

75 19 Can *onhete* really be *NED*'s *anhut* 'strike against'? The phonology would be difficult, as all the other examples of *anhut* have *u*, as we should expect *Onhete* could have either close or open long *e*, since both sounds rhyme in this stanza (*sušte* 13, *þrēte* 21) The word might possibly be *onhēte*, 'persecute,' since OE *onhetting* exists in this sense, but one would have to assume

<sup>5</sup> Wright-Wulcker, *Anglo-Saxon and Old English Vocabularies* (London, 1884), II, 593 23

<sup>6</sup> Lynn Thorndike, *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, II (1923), 860

<sup>7</sup> In view of the doubt about the meaning of *loket* it should be said that since lye and urine were used as detergents they might as well have been applied to ornamental lockets of metal as to hair, but I am inclined to think that Malone's interpretation of *loket* as 'lock' is correct



that the verb was associated with *hēte*-forms of the verb *hate* (see *NED*), themselves influenced by OE *hete*, sb OE *onhātan* 'inflamm' is possible phonologically, but hardly fits the rest of the line. The general meaning of lines 18-20 is that a man who lives in illicit pleasure injures his fortune against the time when he moves hence, i.e., in the life after death. Lines 21-22, 'alle is þriuene þewes þrete, þat þenkeþ nout on þenne' mean 'all his ingrained habits threaten the man that does not think of that time'. It is thus not desirable to emend *þenne* with Malone to *wenne*.

The following stanza is even more obscure. The first four lines (23-26) as printed by Brown read

azeynes þenne vs þreteþ þre,  
 zef he beþ þryuen & þowen in þeode,  
 vr soule bone so broþerh [MS broerh] be  
 as berne best þat bale forbeode

*Vr soule bone* (25) is neither Boddeker's 'unsere geben allein,' nor Brown's 'our soul's good,' but 'our soul's destroyer'. *Bone* from OE *bana*, *bona*, 'slayer,' 'destroyer' is not only the form we should expect in a West Midland text,<sup>8</sup> but the one we actually find in such texts as *Seinte Marhareie*,<sup>9</sup> and the *Ancren Riwele*, where the phrase *soule bone* occurs.<sup>10</sup> If Brown's emendation of *broerh* to *broþerh* is correct, we might, putting a semi-colon after 23 and a comma after 24 paraphrase the lines thus: 'Against that time, three foes threaten us, if he is thriving and prosperous among people our soul's destroyer may be as "brotherly" as the best hero who may prevent harm'. The 'soul's destroyer,' in other words, is a false friend. At first sight, it seems natural to identify the foe with the devil, who is called 'a false friend' in *xiv*, 27-10. But it is more probable that the flesh is here meant, both because of the phraseology of the rest of the stanza and because of the references to the world and the devil in stanzas five and six. In *The Sayings of St Bernard Man's Three Foes* of the Vernon manuscript, we are told

Ac he þat schulde best be þi frend  
 Doþ þe rapest to fall

<sup>8</sup> On the dialect, see G. L. Brooks, *Leeds Studies in English* II (1933), 61.

<sup>9</sup> Ed. F. M. Mack, *EETS*, 193, 30-15, and glossary.

<sup>10</sup> Ed. J. Morton, p. 222.

And þat is þi flesch, þi furste fo  
 þat þou pamprest and seruest so <sup>10a</sup>

29 30   Fyth of oþer ne darþ he fleo  
           þat fleishshes fannyng furst fortode

Brown, in a recent letter, which he permits me to cite, is disposed to accept as the MS reading *foreode* instead of the *fortode* which he printed, since the difference is very slight paleographically in the hand of this scribe. He would also emend *darþ* to *ðarf*, and translate 'He who has first forgone (or abstained from) the temptation of the flesh, which is the falsest of five, need not flee combat with any other (foe)'. It seems to me that this interpretation must be accepted. *Darþ* is not a proper form in Middle English, since the third singular of *dare* still had no ending in Middle English, and the *NED* records no *-(e)th* ending until the sixteenth century. *Falsest of five*, I should take to be a reference to the five senses, in the extended meaning given to them in the Middle Ages. The last lines 'ȝef we leueþ eny leode, werryng is worst of wyue,' now follow naturally. 'If we believe any man, warfare of a woman is the worst,' i. e. 'any one will tell you that the temptation of the flesh is the worst'.

XIII, 76 20 'He is solsecle to sanne is forsoht' is the last line of a stanza in which the names of flowers are applied to the beloved Annot. *He*, as regularly, is here 'she' from OE *hēo*. Brown follows Boddeker in deriving *sanne* from ON *sanna*, 'to maintain as true,' 'affirm,' a word which the *NED* records only from Orm, and which Brown defines here 'maintain, defend'. *Forsoht* is glossed 'afflicted,' from OE *forsēcan*, 'afflict,' 'punish,' but I do not understand the sense or the syntax of the line with the words thus defined. Is not *sanne* the same word as *sane* of line 34, i. e. 'heal'? The line would then mean 'she is the marigold that is sought after for healing'. The marigold was used for medicinal purposes, and *forseke* means 'to seke out,' rather than 'afflict' in Middle English (see the *NED*, s. v. *forseek*).

XIII, 76 34 *Sucre* here is not 'succor,' but 'sugar' following properly upon the sweet remedy *licoris* (33). 35 *bayeþ me mi*

<sup>10a</sup> *Minor Poems of the Vernon MS*, ed. Furnivall II, 515, *EETS*, 117. Sister Mary Immaculate Creek, of the Yale Graduate School, called my attention to this passage as bearing on the order of the three foes and the meaning of *vr soule bone*.

*bone* Tolkien and Gordan correctly point out in their note on line 327 of *Sir Gawayn* that *bayeþ* should be *bayþeþ*, as in *Sir Gawayn*. 'I schal barþen þy bone' Other occurrences of the phrase are cited, and the word derived from ON \**berðna*, later *berna* 'to further (a request)'

XIV, 23 25 *Tene* is glossed 'teen,' 'suffering,' but should be 'ten,' as the Anglo Norman original cited in the notes, p 252, shows *Meuz vaut vn ben devaunt la mort / ke dis apres*

XIV, 27 56 'þat he [death] haþ sammned in site, Loue wel he sunder' *Loue*, which I do not understand, may be an error for *Sone*, since alliteration occurs almost invariably in these lines

XIV, 49 7 'No loue þer nis þat oure halle lysse' means 'there is no love that may comfort all of us' *Lysse* is not a noun, as glossed, but a verb, from OE *lissan*

XIV, 81 24 The poet says that your executors at your death

Of þe ne wil rek, bot skelk and skek ful boldly in þi bowrs

*Skelk* is defined as 'skulk,' but the word occurs nowhere else with an *e*, and the meaning is difficult because people can hardly 'skulk' full boldly. The *skelk* of the Thornton manuscript, is a mere variant of the next verb, *skek* 'to plunder' The word in Brown's Cambridge text may be *skelt* 'hasten,' of obscure origin, which occurs in the alliterative poetry, for example, in *Purity* 1554, *Erkenwald*, 278

XIV, 104 4 'Wiþ feire beheste and wordes as wylde' The Simeon manuscript has *wynde*, and this is rightly substituted for the *wylde* of Vernon in Varnhagen's text<sup>11</sup> *Wynde* is required for the rhyme with *fynde*, *behynde*, *mynde*, and is, in any case, a more sensible reading Words are frequently called *wind* or compared to *wind* to indicate 'idle talk,' as may be seen from the *NED*'s examples, s v *wind* sb 14

XIV, 106 51 In his notes Brown suggests that the text should read *bos*, pres 3rd sg of *behoues*, in the line which he had printed 'And alle o deþ, hos boþe drye' The emendation is correct, but Brown is wrong, I think, in assuming that *alle* and *boþe* are pleonastic, and in suggesting the omission of *alle*. The meaning of lines 49-52 is 'Man dies and beasts die, and it is all one (1 e the same sort of) happening, and both must suffer one and the same

<sup>11</sup> Anglia vii (1884), 304

death and have one incarnation' *Alle* is an adverb modifying *one*, and *alle one* means 'one and the same,' 'quite the same,' as the *NED*'s examples show, s v *all*, C adv 5

ROBERT J MENNER

*Yale University*

# A NOTE ON "A SONG OF THE FIVE JOYS"

In his *Religious Lyrics of the XIV Century*, Professor Carleton Brown has made available for the first time an accurate transcription of a poem on the Five Joys<sup>1</sup> contained in MS Harley, 2253, folio 81<sup>b</sup>. His improvement over the work of his predecessors<sup>2</sup> is most evident, perhaps, in stanza six (ll 31-36), describing the Nativity of Christ, the second of the Five Joys according to the conventional medieval enumeration

þat oþer ioie of þat may	31
wes o cristesmasse day,	
when god wes bore on þoro lay	
ant brohte vs lyhtnesse	
þe ster wes seie by-fore day—	
þis hirdes bereþ wytnesse	36

After noting several differences in the transcriptions of previous editors,<sup>3</sup> Professor Brown says that Boddeker's rendition of line 33, "When God was born, in a crib lay," cannot be accurate because in all other instances *þrowe* means not "crib" but "coffin," and because *lay* is not a verb but a noun. He then translates *lay* as "law," eliminates the necessity of emendation by using *þoro* as an adjective, and cites as his authority *NED*, "thorough" (under a). He renders the entire clause, "When God was born according to law," or "in due form"<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Religious Lyrics* (1929), pp 13-14

<sup>2</sup> The poem was printed in 1841 by Thomas Wright, in *Specimens of Lyric Poetry*, pp 94-96, in 1874 by Karl Boddeker in *Altenglische Dichtungen*, pp 218-219, and in 1878 by R P Wulker in *Altenglisches Lesebuch* I, 48-49

<sup>3</sup> Wright and Wulker, misreading line 33, "when god wes bore on þoro lay," printed *thore* instead of *þoro*. Boddeker, by emendation, printed *þrowe*, equated it with *þrowe*, and defined it as *Krippe*. In line 35, he read *þestri* for *þe ster*

<sup>4</sup> *Religious Lyrics of the XIV Century*, p 246, note 11

Although this translation approaches a satisfactory interpretation, I do not think it is correct. While *lay* may be "law," *NED* gives *poro* as "due" only in a unique instance occurring in 1581. In the adjectival form cited by Professor Brown, the usual meanings of *poro* are "going, passing, or extending through." Or, (under 2, a) "thoroughgoing, perfect," that is, complete or entire. But in the whole range of ordinary usage, there is nothing corresponding to the sense which Professor Brown suggests.

The theological reasons for rejecting this reading are even more substantial. Even if the line could be defended linguistically as "God was born in due form," or "according to law," this would be in opposition to the attitude of the medieval poet toward the Virgin Birth of Christ, which, like the Conception, he believed took place not according to, but "*withhuten lawe of moder*"<sup>5</sup>. This dogma of *virginitas in partu* as logically distinct from *virginitas in conceptione*, taught that the Blessed Virgin Mary during parturition was inviolate, by the same power, according to St. Augustine, "which afterwards conducted the body of the young man through locked doors"<sup>6</sup>. This belief in the Virgin Birth of Christ, defined as an Article of Faith by the Fifth General Council of Constantinople in 553 and again by the Lateran Council at Rome in 640, has never been disputed by the Fathers,<sup>7</sup> and has been found in Jewish-Christian poetry as early as the last quarter of the first century.<sup>8</sup> Thus, unless our poem be unique in the literature of the Five Joys, the interpretation "in due form" is not plausible.

There is, of course, the possibility that the phrase suggested by Professor Brown is a poetic expression of St. Paul's epistle to the

<sup>5</sup> *Lyrics of the XIII Century*, p. 76, ll. 35-37. Italics are mine.

<sup>6</sup> Migne, *P. L.* xxxiii, Ep. 137, ad Volusiano, 8.

<sup>7</sup> St. Ambrose, among others, believes the Virgin Birth to have been prefigured in Ezekiel 44:2. Commenting on this passage he says, "Bona porta, Maria, quae clausa erat et non aperiebatur. Transivit per eam Christus, sed non aperuit" (*De Instit. Virg.* viii, n. 53, *P. L.*, 16). Isaiah, 7:14, is also frequently cited, because according to this prophecy, a virgin would not only conceive but bear a son. St. Bernard remarks, "Conceptus fuit sine pudore partus sine dolore," (*P. L.* 183, 401-402). St. Thomas gives the intrinsic physiological reason for this as taught by St. Augustine, and also refers to its foundation in the New Testament as interpreted by St. Jerome (*Summa*, 3a, Q. 35, Art. 6).

<sup>8</sup> *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, ed. J. Rendel Harris, Cambridge, 1909, Ode 19, p. 114.

Galatians, 4 4 "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law" This still does not mean "in due form," however, but under the Mosaic Law And even if this rendition should be accepted, it would be out of harmony with the line, "and brought us light," which follows, would mark a departure from the convention, and would make the translation "under" for *on þoro* unwarranted

I suggest that the word *lay* be taken as "light" The New English Dictionary gives this form under *leye*, meaning a fire, blaze or flame, from Old Mercian *lēg*, (WS *lieg*). Examples are "Wīþ þe lai louerd of þe holiġost tend mine heorte," (1240, *Lofsong in Cott Hom* 205) "This stone yf it be set by the fyre anone it wexyþ on a laye," (1398 Trevisa *Barth De P. R.* xvi, xxviii, 1495) This opens up several new possibilities If the word *þoro* be taken as indicating means or agency, the passage might be rendered "When God was born through light," in which case "light" would be used in one of its commonest metaphorical senses as figurative of the Blessed Virgin Mary No analogy of the Virgin Birth was more popular than that of a light or flame from which light proceeds without rupture Such lines as "Stella solem genuisti,"<sup>9</sup> "Ave, per quam lux data,"<sup>10</sup> or

Ave, caeli lux et terrae  
Summam lucem digna ferre,  
Quae te non deseruit,<sup>10</sup>

are too numerous in both the Latin and English tradition to need more than mention They seem, in spirit at least, to correspond with the Latin lyric which Professor Brown cites as the original<sup>11</sup> While this interpretation is pleasing and enriches the entire stanza both in its literal and figurative sense, I do not think it was intended by the poet It is not likely that he would have said, as

<sup>9</sup> Dreyes, G M *Analecta Hymnica*, Leipzig, 1899, xxxii, 59

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*, p 63

<sup>11</sup>

Secundum, cum puerum,  
vulgo, peperisti,  
Et erranti populo  
lucem protulisti,  
Cum tu, pura, puerum,  
pannis involvisti  
Et pastores gaudii  
testes recepisti (Dreyes, *Anal* xxxi, 175)

though in explanation, 'The star was seen before the day,' if the star were Mary, despite the fact that she is often called the Morning Star which precedes the Dawn. Nor is it likely that he would have said, "God was born through light," when the usual expression is something equivalent to "Light was born through light." Even if this rendition were accepted, one would probably have to emend *bore on* to *boren*. I offer the interpretation merely in anticipation of this conjecture.

Again, one might take the word *þoro* in its adjectival use as "going, passing or extending through." The line might then suggest that other stock figure of light shining through a glass, which is employed not only as a symbol of the Conception of Christ as Professor Brown remarks,<sup>12</sup> but just as frequently of the Virgin Birth, as many of the lyrics in his editions testify.<sup>13</sup> The line would then read, "When God was born as passing light." But since there is no justification for translating "on" as "as," I reject this rendition likewise.<sup>14</sup>

Finally, the word *þoro* may be interpreted as complete or entire, that is, "fully what is expressed by the noun" (*NED*). This gives the rendition "When God was born in perfect light," similar to such lines on the Nativity as

þei stoden & streden after þe sterie  
þat lemede ful lihte<sup>15</sup>

There is a probability, I think, that this interpretation is correct. Linguistically it is justified, since *NED* gives instances in which *on* (under 16 lb) is used where current usage prefers "in," "during," or "at," as in the example, "God sent him a tokenyng on nyght als he slepe" (c. 1330 R. Mannyng of Brunne, *Chron.*, 1810). While an exact parallel to *þoro lay* is not cited until 1719 (De Foe Crusoe, I. 214, "In the Morning, even before it was

<sup>12</sup> *Religious Lyrics*, p. 229, note 21.

<sup>13</sup> *Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, p. 49, ll. 73-78, p. 231, ll. 33-40, p. 46, ll. 21-25, *Lyrics of the Thirteenth Century*, p. 140, ll. 20-24.

<sup>14</sup> *NED* also gives instances in which "leye" is used in reference to the Holy Ghost. This could not be the meaning here, because Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, but not born through Him. *NED* also gives "on (a) laye," as meaning "on fire." This suggests Isaiah 10 17, "And the light of Israel shall be as a fire, and the Holy One thereof as a flame," but contextually the rendition does not seem appropriate.

<sup>15</sup> *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century*, p. 76, ll. 41-42.

thorow Day-light"), there are such similar expressions as "thorow search" (c. 1487) and "thurgh end" (1500)

Traditionally the interpretation is sound, because it is difficult to find either a sermon or a poem on the Nativity which does not stress the miraculous brilliance of the star "Nox enim ut dies illuminata est," is the expression of St Bernard<sup>16</sup> Honorius of Autun taxes the utmost resources of language to convey the same idea<sup>17</sup> While all exegetes might not agree with him, St Ambrose goes so far as to say that the "star" was in reality the sun which anticipated its course "Ex eo denique factum puto, ut nox decresceret, dum sol festinus ob dominicae nativitatis obsequium ante mundo lucem protulit, quam nox cursum sui temporis consummaret Quin potius ipsam noctem fuisse non dico, nec aliquid obscuritatis habuisse in qua pastores pervigilant, exultant angeli, astra deserviunt"<sup>18</sup>

This interpretation is in complete harmony with the tradition found in a well-known antiphon of Lauds, "Stella ista sicut flamma coruscat, et regem regum Deum demonstrat,"<sup>19</sup> or in such lines as the following from *The Three Kings of Cologne* "þe sterre had ȝeue so gret lȝt in att þe plaas þer Cryst was, þat hit semyd to hem as þouȝ þei had stonde in a fourneys of fyre"<sup>20</sup> Even more striking, perhaps, is this passage occurring earlier in the same source

þe same nyȝt and þe same oure þat god was bore þe same sterre beganne to arise in maner of a sunne briȝt schynyng, and so aftir in þe foorme of an egle hit ascendid aboue þe hille // And al þat day in þe highest place of þe eyre hit abode withoute any mevyng, in so mochel þat, whan þe sonne was moost hote and moost hȝe, þere was no difference in schynyng bitwix þe sterre and þe sonne Neþerles sum bokes seiȝe þat in þe same daye þat god was bore, were many sonnes seiȝe but whan þis day of þe Natyurte of oure lorde was passed, þe sterre ascendid vp in to þe firmament and þe sterre þat thus schewed, is no-thing liche to sterres þat be peynted here in diuers places for hit had riȝt many longe strakys and beemys, more brenning and more lȝter than a bronde of fuyre, and as an egle fleyng and betyng þe eyre with his wynges, riȝt so the strakys and þe beemys of þe sterre stered hym-self aboute and þe sterre had in hym self a fourme and a liknesse of a ȝonge childe, and aboue hym a signe of þe holy cros,

<sup>16</sup> Migne, *Patrol Lat*, 183, col 126

<sup>17</sup> Migne, *Op cit*, 172, col 815 ff

<sup>18</sup> Migne, *Op cit*, 16, col 614-615

<sup>19</sup> Migne, *P L*, 78, col 743

<sup>20</sup> *The Three Kings of Cologne*, ed C Horstmann, *EETS*, 1886, p 71



and a voys was herde in þe sterre seying NATUS EST NOBIS HODIE REX  
IUDEORUM QUI EST EXSPECTACIO GENCIIUM & DOMINATOR EORUM <sup>21</sup>

The rendition is justified contextually. All other interpretations of line 33 give to line 35 the structural function of padding. If a star appeared what marvel was there in its being seen before day? What need would there be for verification by witnesses? On the other hand, if "night was in the midst of her course," the fact that "God was born in perfect light" calls for explanation, and a star from which proceeded this extraordinary brilliance of day itself, but appearing before the day, would be provocative of wonder.

*Lay* is used, I think, not only because it rhymes with "day," but because "light" would make the proximity of "lyhtnesse" in the following line displeasing. The repetition of the sense, however, suggests the verse of Isaiah, 9:2 on which many of the lyrics were based: "The people that walk in darkness have seen a great light to whom that dwelt in the shadow of death, light is risen." Line 33 on physical light, followed by line 34 on the figurative light of Christ is a common sequence. The entire stanza would mean, then, that although according to the measure of time, it was night, "The second joy of that maid was on Christmas *day*, when God was born in full light, and brought light to us: the star was seen before the day—the shepherds bear it witness."

SISTER MARY IMMACULATE, C S C

*New Haven, Connecticut*

## JACOB AND THE HOOLY JEW

Ever since Skeat advanced the conjecture in his edition of Chaucer,<sup>1</sup> Chaucerian editors have persistently followed him in suggesting that the "hooly Jew" to whose sheep's shoulder bone Chaucer's Pardoner ascribes magical powers (C, 350-71), may be the Biblical Jacob. Though qualifying the identification with a

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 32. The original Latin by John of Hildesheim was written between 1364 and 1375. Although the translation which I have quoted belongs to the fifteenth century, the sense of the passage corresponds perfectly with the original. Cf. *Historiarum Truium Regum*, cap. VIII, p. 224.

<sup>1</sup> *Complete Works of Chaucer* (Oxford, 1894), v, 271.

'perhaps' or a 'probably' Koch,<sup>2</sup> Hinckley,<sup>3</sup> Manly,<sup>4</sup> and Robinson<sup>5</sup> adopt Skeat's guess<sup>6</sup>

For the original speculation there was small basis. Since Skeat there has been no testimony adduced in support of that speculation.<sup>7</sup> Reexamination of the evidence for Skeat's initial conjecture fails to justify the inclusion of the note in subsequent editions of Chaucer's works.

To the shoulder bone "Which that was of an hooly Jewes sheep" (C, 351) Chaucer's Pardoner attributes wonder-working genius to cure snake-bite, tape worm, variola, scab, to multiply cattle and wealth, to dissolve jealousy. The multiplying of wealth could be achieved only by following a ritual which "thilke hooly Jew oure eldres taughte" (C, 364).

By this last reference it is apparent that the holy Jew was one of the Old Testament patriarchs. That this patriarch was Jacob, Skeat surmised after collating the passage with Genesis xxx. A suggestive parallel to the lines in the *Pardoner's Prologue* was discovered in the fact that 1) Jacob had sheep, 2) he dipped rods in water from which the flocks drank, which made them conceive, 3) by means of this magical trick his cattle and wealth were increased. Though Jacob's wizardry was accomplished not through a sheep-bone but through the use of wooden rods, Skeat would have us assume that the thaumaturgic properties of the rods were somehow transferred to the shoulder-bone of Jacob's sheep.

As Manly has pointed out,<sup>8</sup> there is almost nothing in the account of Jacob's trick to explain the effects of the shoulder bone. In the Genesis version, Jacob's chief intent was to make sheep and goats bring forth their young changed in appearance and color to correspond with the pilled rods which he placed before them as they drank from the water. In the *Pardoner's Prologue* there is no

<sup>2</sup> *Pardoner's Prologue and Tale*, Chaucer Society Publication, 2 Series 35, p. 106.

<sup>3</sup> *Notes on Chaucer* (Northampton, 1907), p. 165.

<sup>4</sup> *CT* (New York, 1931), p. 615.

<sup>5</sup> *Chaucer's Complete Works* (Boston, 1933), p. 834.

<sup>6</sup> Carleton Brown, however, dissents. "As the Pardoner did not think it necessary to be more precise, it seems idle to speculate on his identity." *The Pardoner's Tale* (Oxford, 1935), p. 29.

<sup>7</sup> There is little substance to an additional conjecture that the 'hooly Jew' is not Jacob but Gideon (Judges vi). *MLN* (1928), XLIII, 536.

<sup>8</sup> *Op cit*, p. 615.

suggestion of any such effects By drinking water into which the shoulder bone of the Jew's sheep has been dipped, beasts are simply cured of their illnesses They neither increase in numbers nor bring forth strange-colored offspring The Pardoner's prescript does provide for an increase in cattle and goods, but only if the goodman himself, not the cattle, drink potions of the shoulder bone

If that the goodman that the beestes oweth  
 Wol evry wyke, er that the cok hym croweth,  
 Fastynge, drynken of this welle a draughte,  
 As thilke hooly Jew oure eldres taughte,  
 His beestes and his stoor shal multiple (C, 361-65)

Nothing in the Biblical account of Jacob offers a parallel to this passage in the *Pardoner's Prologue* If any holy Jew ever taught such ritualistic hocus pocus to "oure eldres," it was not Jacob. Finally, no support for Skeat's identification is provided by the last virtue credited to a potion of the shoulder bone, that of blinding a cuckold to his wife's infidelity

It is apparent that in hazarding an identification of the "hooly Jew" with Jacob, Skeat chose to ignore the many points at which the two failed to coincide The variance is by no means insignificant, comprising as it does the bulk of the Pardoner's prescript. When it is likewise realized that Chaucer had two opportunities to identify the holy Jew but chose both times to avoid an identification, there seems little to justify Skeat's guess

That the attempt to ascribe the shoulder-bone of the sheep to a particular individual is gratuitous is further suggested by a passage in the *Parson's Tale* There Chaucer represents the Parson denouncing "false enchauntours or nigromanciens" who practice their occult art of divination "in bacyns ful of water . . . or in a shulderboon of a sheep" (I, 603). These, thunders the Parson, "doon cursedly and dampnably agayns Crist and al the feith of hooly chirche" (I, 604) There is ground for the assumption that this "shulderboon of a sheep" used in divination in the *Parson's Tale* inspired the creation of the "sholder-boon Which that was of an hooly Jewes sheep" in the *Pardoner's Prologue*. The number of passages in the *Pardoner's Tale* derived from or parallel with portions of the *Parson's Tale* upholds this hypothesis.<sup>9</sup> J L Lowes

<sup>9</sup> Emil Koeppel, Herrig's *Archiv* (1891), LXXXVII, 39-41, Victor Langhans, *Anglia* (n f XLI, 1929), LIII, 246

assumes its validity ". . . the Pardoner's shoulder bone of a sheep with its use as a charm for curing animals (and even men) comes also from the *Parson's Tale*"<sup>10</sup>

Further evidence other than a verbal one of the connection between the two passages is offered by a comparison of the uses of the shoulder bone in the two passages in question. In each instance the shoulder bone is employed superstitiously, though to different ends. Indeed, an examination of the claims the Pardoner makes for the shoulder bone relic suggests that these are as fit a subject for the Parson's reprobation as the superstitious trick of divination by sheep bone. Far from suiting the procedure usual in the employment of sacred relics, the Pardoner's prescription suggests rather the cabalistic ritual "of adjuracioun and conjuracioun as doon these false enchauntours or nigromanciens" condemned by the Parson. A relic which, dipped in water, can cure beasts, which, taken once a week at sunrise before touching food, can increase wealth, which, dipped in broth, can allay the suspicion of a husband cuckolded by priests, is less relic than talisman or charm.<sup>11</sup>

In view of these facts, the assumed identity of the powers of the sheep-bone relic with those of Jacob's rods becomes still less credible. The original sheep bone used in divination, belonged to no holy Jew, rather, it was associated with a superstitious practice which the Parson had unequivocally damned. The shoulder bone in the *Pardoner's Tale*, we have shown, is likewise associated with pagan practices though described as a sacred relic belonging to a "hooly Jew". Would it not be incongruous to identify the holy Jew on the basis of these practices now demonstrated as pagan, on the basis of a sheep bone relic associated in Chaucer's mind with a pagan ritual? Yet it was on these bases that Skeat advanced his identification of the holy Jew. Evidence that points to a separation in Chaucer's mind between the 'shoulder bone of a sheep' and the

<sup>10</sup> *PMLA* (1915), xxx, 265

<sup>11</sup> In his edition of *The Pardoner's Tale*, Carleton Brown has called attention to the similarity of the Pardoner's instructions to those found in medieval charms and remedies for healing beasts, and suggests here the influence of medieval folk-lore.

*Op cit*, p. x

In the section of the *Parson's Tale* immediately following the "shulder-boon of a sheep" passage, the Parson arraigns the use of "Charmes for woundes or maladie of men or of beestes" (I, 606)

'holy Jew,' and establishes a division between its character as a relic and the powers assigned to it, hardly allows for an identification which depends on the intimate relation of all four

Though Chaucer did not have Jacob in mind in fathering the shoulder bone relic upon a "hooly Jew," the fact that it is a holy Jew's relic which commands such anomalous powers may not be without significance. For the Pardoner's superstitious peasant audience, the powers credited to the sheep bone would seem the more potent for having been derived from a Jew. In addition to sharing with Christian relics the glory of inspiring miracles,<sup>12</sup> the relic of a holy Jew would be reputed to have special dispensations. For one, the Jew in the Middle Ages was famed in medicine as the heir to the nostrums of Araby,<sup>13</sup> his relic, consequently, would be an instrument possessing vicariously the therapeutic powers of the Hebrews, receiving them by the same process by which the relic of a saint is endowed with his specific virtues. The power of curing the illnesses of beasts, therefore, would be within the special province of a holy Jew's relic. Further, the fact that the relic was that of a Jew and not of a Christian justified the Pardoner's ascribing to it almost any capacities, however uncanonical they might be. No question of orthodoxy was involved in the use of a Jew's relic to serve the interests of Christian folk. Consequently, in proposing the use of the relic to increase wealth, the Pardoner would feel perfectly free to prescribe a ritual ceremony, as well as to invest the shoulder bone of the sheep with the precious virtue of making a wittol out of a cuckold. In the minds of the peasant auditors there would be no concern about these, there would be only the satisfaction of having a Church benediction over their avarice.

The humor of representing an old sheep bone as the potent relic of an Old Testament worthy has long been appreciated, but there now becomes apparent a supplement to the jest: the representation of the holy Jew's relic as possessed of pagan, even sacrilegious

<sup>12</sup> Reliquaries commonly contained the relics of Old Testament worthies and events. The body of the prophet Samuel, the original wood of Noah's ark, rods used by Aaron and Moses when working their wonders before Pharaoh, were among souvenirs treasured and employed as specifics against all the ills to which the flesh is heir. Jocelyn Rhys, *The Reliquary* (London, 1930), pp. 14, 15, 51.

<sup>13</sup> Donald Campbell, *Arabian Medicine and its Influence on the Middle Ages* (London, 1926), I, 115, 138, 140.

powers This incongruity has helped to establish the error of Skeat in identifying the "hooly Jew" with Jacob More significantly, it has extended one point further, evidence of Chaucer's satirical wit

LEO J. HENKIN

Brooklyn College

## CHAUCER'S ARCHANGEL

In *Notes and Queries*, CLXXV, no 19 (Nov 5, 1938), 332, D'Arcy W Thompson, the distinguished author of *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford, 1895), offers an explanation of the bird-name "archaungell" in line 915 of Chaucer's "Romaunt of the Rose." The passage in question reads

912 And he (Cupide) was aȝr with briddes wryen  
With popynmay with nyghtyngale  
With Chalaundie and with wodewale  
With fynche with lark and with archaungeȝ  
He semede as he were an Aungeȝ  
That doun were comen fro heuene clere <sup>1</sup>

Thompson finds "no similar word among the many English provincial bird-names recorded by Swanson or by Kirke Swann, nor among the French and other foreign bird-names collected by Roland, Giglioli, Suolahti and others" "Archaungell" is commonly translated "titmouse" because it apparently is meant to parallel "mesange" in the "Roman de la Rose," Chaucer's source, where the corresponding passage reads

893 Car il iert tout covers d' oisiaus,  
De papegaus, de rossignaus,  
De calandres et de mesanges,  
Il sembloit que ce fust uns anges  
Qui fust tout droit venus du ciau <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Max Kaluza, *The Romaunt of the Rose from the Unique Glasgow Ms Parallel with its Original Le Roman de la Rose* Part I (1891), p 55

<sup>2</sup> O c, p 54 See, e g, Robert Bell's edition of Chaucer's works (London, 1855), p 43, note "The Archaungelle appears to mean the bird called the titmouse, as *mesange*, which bears this signification, is the word in the original In Urry's Glossary, archaungelle is erroneously interpreted an herb so called," and the edition by W W Skeat (Oxford, 1929), note to line 915 "archaungell = titmouse"

But Thompson claims that "its meaning and origin are alike unknown." He concludes that "archaungell" is a literary, not a vernacular name and that Chaucer originally wrote something like this

With finch, with lark and with acaunthyl,  
He semede as he were an aungel

"Acaunthyl," Thompson suggests, is Chaucer's adaptation of *ἀκανθαλὶς* or *acanthyllis*, meaning goldfinch or siskin.<sup>3</sup> Under the influence of "aungell" in the next line scribes, we are led to assume, corrupted Chaucer's "acaunthyl" into "acanthal" = "acanal," where the *h* might easily be mistaken for a *g*, "and so to 'arcangal' and 'archangel'!"

Thompson's "devious but still easy road" is certainly an ingenious explanation of the *hapax legomenon* "archaungell."<sup>4</sup> In my opinion, his explanation is too ingenious. It amounts to legerdemain. I herewith offer a simpler answer.

With Thompson I assume that scribes corrupted the bird-name which Chaucer had originally set down in line 915. This original bird-name, I claim, is not a literary, but a vernacular name, and its origin and meaning are known.

My guess is that Chaucer, in his search for a bird-name which would rime with "aungell," chose the name of the bird who is known to-day as the red-backed shrike (*Lanius collurio*). This bird is a singer and has plumage gay enough to warrant its inclusion in Cupid's aviary.<sup>5</sup> The Middle-English name of the red-backed shrike is "wariangel." This is a diminutive of the Old English "wearg," meaning "felon" or "criminal."<sup>6</sup> Some form of the diminutive

<sup>3</sup> Cf. D'Arcy W. Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford, 1895), pp. 18 f.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. John S. P. Tatlock and Arthur G. Kennedy, *A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer and to the Romaunt of the Rose* (Published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington (1927), p. 39, s. v. "archangel.")

<sup>5</sup> See Pechuel Loesche (ed.), *Brehms Tierleben*, *Vogel*, I (Leipzig-Wien, 1891), pp. 492 f.

<sup>6</sup> F. H. Stratmann, *Middle-English Dictionary* ed. by H. Bradley (Oxford, 1891), 669 f. "wariangel" = butcher bird. This (butcher-bird) is one of the modern provincial names of the great grey shrike (*Lanius excubitor*) and of the red-backed shrike (*Lanius collurio*), cf. Charles Swainson, *The Folk Lore and Provincial Names of British Birds* (London, 1886), p. 47, H. Kirke Swann, *A Dictionary of English and Folk-Names of*

of "wearg" must have been the standard name, or at least one of the standard names, of the *Lanius collurio* in England and in Germany at Chaucer's time. It occurs already in Old High German glosses.<sup>7</sup> In Middle English it is found in the form of "wayryngle" in *The Wars of Alexander*.<sup>8</sup> Suolahti lists related forms, e. g., "wargil," for Middle High German "Warkengel," "Werkengel," "Werckhengel" are recorded for sixteenth-century Germany.<sup>9</sup> And the name lives on to-day in a number of variations as one of the provincial names of the red-backed shrike in England and in Germany. England "wariangle," "weirangle," "wirrangle," "wierangel," "wierangle."<sup>10</sup> Germany "Wurgengel," "Worgengel," "Quarkringel," "Warkvogel," "Wartenkrenal."<sup>11</sup>

Chaucer evidently did not have to go far afield in order to find a bird-name that would rime with "aungell." As a matter of fact, he was acquainted with the name "wariangel." He used it line 1408 of the "Friar's Tale."

D 1407      This Somonour/that was as ful of Iangles  
As ful of venym been thise waryngles.<sup>12</sup>

---

*British Birds* (London, 1913), p. 37, Hugo Suolahti, *Die deutschen Vogelnamen* (Straszbürg, 1909), p. 147.

<sup>7</sup> Suolahti, *o c*, pp. 148 f. OHG wargengil, wargengel, warkengel, warchengil, warchengel, warechengil, wargengel, warginel, warchengel. Stratzmann, *ibid*. MLG wargingel. Cf. Hermann Stadler (ed.), *Alberti Magni de animalibus* ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen," [Münster i. W., 1916]), VII, 1, 4, pp. 510 f.

avis apud nos quae warchengel vocatur

<sup>8</sup> W. W. Skeat (ed.), *The Wars of Alexander. An Alliterative Romance translated chiefly from the Historia Alexandri Magni de Prelus* ("Early English Text Society. Extra Series," No. XLVII [London, 1886]), p. 94, line 1706 of Ms. Ashmole 44. A wirling, a wayryngle, a wawilezid shrewe, cf. p. 469. "wayryngle," a little villain.

<sup>9</sup> Suolahti, *o c*, p. 149.

<sup>10</sup> Swainson, *o c*, p. 47, Swann, *o c*, p. 256, Joseph Wright, *The English Dialect Dictionary* VI (London, 1905), p. 385.

<sup>11</sup> Suolahti, *o c*, p. 150, Pechuel Loesche, *o c*, pp. 486, 492. Cf. the form "wargkrenal" in *St. Hildegardis Physica Lib. VI, de avibus*, cap. 55 (Migne, PL CXCII, col. 1307).

<sup>12</sup> *A Sixteenth Century Print of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales. Group D. Fragment V*. This is the reading of the Ellesmere and Corpus Mss. Other readings are "variangelys" (Cambridge Ms.), "wereangles" (Lansdowne Ms.). Miss M. Dean of the Chaucer Laboratory of the University of Chicago has very kindly furnished the following information concerning "Friar's Tale," D 1408. A little over half the Mss., including those on which the text is



"Wariangel" may easily have been copied as "ariangel" and "ariangel," in turn, may have been corrupted into "arc(h)-angel"<sup>13</sup> My suggestion, therefore, is that Chaucer wrote something like this

With fynche with lark and with wariangel  
He semede as he were an aungel

JOHN G. KUNSTMANN

*The University of Chicago*

### CHAUCER'S *TAILLYNGE YNOUGH*, *CANTERBURY TALES*, B<sup>2</sup> 1624 \*

Mr Claude Jones' interpretation<sup>1</sup> of *taillynge* in the last line of the *Shipman's Tale*<sup>2</sup> as a pun involving the meaning "sexual intercourse" has the advantage of being immediately obvious to the modern reader. Such immediate obviousness, however, is not an infallible guide to the meaning of a word in a fourteenth century

based, have "wariangles." Variants are variangles Ds-En<sup>1</sup> Gg, in euery angle G1-Ra<sup>2</sup> -Tc<sup>1</sup>, veeranglis He, wrangleris Hk Ld<sup>2</sup> Mc-Ra<sup>1</sup> Ry<sup>2</sup>, the varyangels I1, veri angeles Ra<sup>2</sup>, warsangelis To, wery hangles Ch Cx<sup>2</sup>, wary angles Cp En<sup>2</sup> F1 Sl<sup>1</sup>, wereganglis Ha<sup>2</sup>, wery angles Ha<sup>4</sup> Mm Ry<sup>1</sup>, wari anglees Ld<sup>1</sup>, warry anglis Se, hys wrangeles Ph<sup>2</sup>. See now Manly-Rickert, *The Text of The Canterbury Tales*, VI (Chicago, 1940), pp 145 f.

<sup>13</sup> Since butcherbird is one of the names of the great grey shrike and of the red backed shrike (see note 6), and since lesser butcherbird is a name of the bearded titmouse (*Panurus biarmicus*, see Swainson, *o c*, pp 30 f), and since "mouse" in titmouse is etymologically identical with the German "Meise" and the French "més-ange," and since the *Ianus minor*, a relative of our *Ianus collurio*, is sometimes called "Meisenkonig" or "Meisenwolf" (Suolahti, *o c*, p 152), some may be tempted to assume a resemblance between the titmouse and the red-backed shrike and to see in this resemblance an (additional) reason of Chaucer's translation of "mesange" by "wariangel," the name of the red-backed shrike. In my opinion, Chaucer was not interested in *translation*. He was interested in finding a rime-word, just as the author of the "Roman de la Rose" had no particular reason for including the "mesanges" in his bird-catalogue, except the need of a word that would rime with "anges."

\* Research Paper 662, Journal Series, University of Arkansas.

<sup>1</sup> "Chaucer's *Taillynge Ynough*," *MLN*, LII (1937), 570

<sup>2</sup> *Canterbury Tales*, B<sup>2</sup> 1624

text, and Mr Jones' suggestion calls for a closer examination than it receives in his brief note, the argument of which may be summarized as follows (1) the word *taille* in B<sup>2</sup> 1606 is probably a pun involving the meanings "tally" and "pudendum", (2) the Shipman's "final blessing is adapted to the story which precedes",<sup>3</sup> (3) *tailng* has today, and possibly had in Chaucer's day, the meaning "sexual intercourse"

Any student moderately familiar with Chaucer's works can easily multiply examples to prove that the meaning of a word at the present day is no safe guide to the Chaucerian meaning. The possibility that a word had a particular meaning in the fourteenth century is not increased by the fact that the same word has that meaning today. Furthermore, possibility is no ground on which to build an argument, it can at best serve only as the basis for a more or less plausible guess when other evidence fails. The only safe grounds for determining the meaning a word had in the fourteenth century are either examples in the works of Chaucer's contemporaries or in other passages in Chaucer of the use of the word in a context that makes the meaning unmistakable, or positive and unmistakable evidence of the meaning in the passage under discussion.

Chaucer used the word *taillynge* (from OFr *tailler*) only once, in B<sup>2</sup> 1624, he used *tailng* (from OE *tæȝl*) nowhere in his extant works. With the exception of Partridge, who dates the meaning from the eighteenth century, and of Farmer and Henley, who give no dates, none of the sources of information I have been able to consult give the verb *tail* with the meaning "to have sexual intercourse". Not anywhere have I found the verbal noun *tailng* with the meaning Mr Jones gives it.<sup>4</sup> The evidence for the interpre-

<sup>3</sup> F. N. Robinson, ed., *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Student's Cambridge Edition (Boston, 1933), p. 839, nt to CT B<sup>2</sup> 1624 (VII, 434 in Robinson's numbering). The passage is quoted by Jones, *loc cit*.

<sup>4</sup> Mr Jones cites no reference or authority for the present day meaning of *tailng*, and at first, because I had never heard the word used with that meaning in the course of a fairly intimate familiarity with the low element—not slang, as Mr Jones calls it—of the vocabulary of the Mid-West, I was inclined to doubt the accuracy of his statement. The verb *tail* is, however, given with the meaning "to coit" by Eric Partridge, *A Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* (New York, 1937), and it is listed among the English synonyms for the verb *ride* with the meaning "to possess carnally" by John S. Farmer and W. E. Henley, *Slang and its Analogues* (Printed for Subscribers Only, 1890-1904). Mr Jones cites the

tation of *taillynge* must be found, then, in the last lines of the *Shipman's Tale* themselves

The late John Koch some twenty-six years ago perceived the significance of "score it upon my taille" in B<sup>2</sup> 1606 for the interpretation, and therefore for the determination of the correct reading of B<sup>2</sup> 1624

Für *Taillynge* lesen C [Corpus 198], L [Lansdowne 851] *Toylyng*, Sl [Sloane 1685] (für G [Gg 4 27]) und H<sup>4</sup> [Harley 7334] *Talynge*, welches alle Edd akzeptieren. Allein abgesehen von der unsicheren burgschaft für diese variante, scheint mir auch der sinn dieses ausdrucks hier nicht recht angemessen. Der liebe Gott soll den pilgern erzählungen bis an ihr lebens ende senden? Ich glaube vielmehr, dass die lesart von E [Ellesmere], He [Hengwrt], D [Dd 4 27], P [Petworth], ähnlich auch die von C, L, ganz richtig ist, und zwar eine etwas schlupfrige beziehung auf v 13 322 [B<sup>2</sup> 1606] enthält, wo die frau ihren gatten auffordert, ihre schuld auf ihr *kerbholz* zu schreiben. sie wolle sie allmahlich im bette abtragen (v 13 330 [B<sup>2</sup> 1614]). Der erzähler (oder die erzählerin? s v 13018 ff [B<sup>2</sup> 1201 ff]) spricht also zum schluss den wunsch aus, es möge solches "kerben," dh der eheliche genuss, allen bis zu ihrem seligen ende vergönnt sein. Ein solcher gedanke wurde dem tone der ganzen erzählung besser entsprechen als der hier unмотivierte wunsch, immer mit erzählungen bedacht zu werden.<sup>5</sup>

The evidence which the context gives for the interpretation of *taillynge* seems to me unmistakable, but the interpretation does not make a pun of *taillynge*, for it gives no evidence that the verbal noun *tailung* was used in Chaucer's day with the meaning "sexual intercourse," the second of the "two completely separate mean-

latter for the meaning of the noun *tail*, but he seems to have overlooked the evidence for the verb

The sources I have been able to examine in addition to Partridge, and Farmer and Henley are *NED*, Bosworth-Toller, Bradley-Stratmann, Halliwell, Wright's *English Dialect Dictionary*, the glossaries in the publications of the Early English Text Society

<sup>5</sup> "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Chaucers *Canterbury Tales*," *Englische Studien*, XLVII (1913-14), 385. Mr Jones apparently overlooked these notes

Although perceiving the innuendo, Koch does not make it clear that he recognized the pun which, I agree with Mr Jones, is probably present in *taille*. Professor Tatlock's reference to a pun "near the end of the *Shipman's Tale*" ("Puns in Chaucer," *Flugel Memorial Volume*, Leland Stanford Junior University Publications, University Series [Stanford University, 1916], p 230) is probably, because of the use of "near," to be taken as referring to B<sup>2</sup> 1606 rather than to B<sup>2</sup> 1624

ings"<sup>6</sup> involved in a pun that is needed here<sup>7</sup> Rather than a pun, *tallynge* involves a subtleness of innuendo that is artistically superior When the Shipman—or even better, the Wife of Bath—asked for “tallyng enough” his hearers were puzzled for the merest fraction of a second, the pun on *taille*, made explicit by B<sup>2</sup> 1614, was still in their minds, so that they immediately interpreted the narrator’s blessing in the light of the system of household accounting employed by the wife of the merchant of Saint Denys The *double entendie* was conveyed, and even the Prioress, who must have assumed her most stately manner before the Miller’s vocabulary and who may well have been offended at the Shipman’s monk and the Host’s remarks<sup>8</sup> could enjoy it without losing her *coun-trefeted cheere of court*

ROBERT A CALDWELL

*The University of Arkansas*

---

### ENGLISH *FUNK*

Sir James Murray says somewhere that English words whose history is obscure may eventually be explained by an examination of modern French patois There is little doubt that a considerable proportion of English words borrowed from French were thoroughly popular in character An examination of French patois of the west and the northwest, prompted by an article of Antoine Thomas,<sup>1</sup> has enabled us to explain *funk*, the origin of which is noted as unknown or uncertain in the etymological dictionaries

The *NED*.<sup>2</sup> lists several *funk*. We are not considering here

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232, nt. 15

<sup>7</sup> I am fully aware of the danger inherent in the argument from negative evidence on which my refusal to admit a pun in *tallynge* depends It is, however, better to be limited by negative evidence to the extent of refusing to go beyond the conclusions warranted by what positive evidence exists, than it is to assume an unsubstantiated meaning for a word merely to support an interpretation that is not needed and that is artistically inferior

<sup>8</sup> Cf. George Lyman Kittredge, *Chaucer and his Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass., 1915), pp. 174-5

<sup>1</sup> *Notes étymologiques et lexicographiques, Romania* xxxix (1910), 231

<sup>2</sup> *The New English Dictionary*, edited by J. A. H. Murray, Oxford, 1888 etc

*funk* (sb.<sup>1</sup>) 'spark,' which is Germanic in origin, nor *funh* (sb.<sup>2</sup>) 'strong smell or stink,' which is probably to be associated with FUMIGARE (*REW* 3570), but the *funk* which is listed in the *NED* (IV, 607a) as follows

FUNK sb.<sup>3</sup> *slang* First mentioned as Oxford slang, possibly as Lye suggests a Flemish *fonck* (Kilian), the origin of which is unknown 1 Cowering fear, a state of panic or shrinking terror 2 One who funks, a coward 1743

FUNK v.<sup>2</sup> *slang* Belongs to FUNK sb.<sup>3</sup> 1 *intr* To flinch or shrink through fear, 'to show the white feather', to try to back out of anything 1737-39 2 *trans* To fight shy of, wish or try to shirk or evade (an undertaking, duty, etc.) Also to *funk* it 3 To fear, be afraid of a person 4 To frighten or scare

These words are attested late in the literature (*funk* sb.<sup>3</sup> 1743, *funk* v.<sup>2</sup> 1737-39) and their remote past seems to offer no documentation, but the fact that they have not appeared earlier may be attributed to their colloquial character, and there is no reason for supposing that they are not old words

The patois of western and northwestern France show a series of words which we wish immediately to confront with *funk*

- (a) Haut-Maine (Le Mans) *feunIQUE*, *founIQUE*, *funIQUE*, adj 'sujet à s'effrayer, qui fouine facilement, quinteux, capricieux, impressionable' <sup>3</sup>
- (b) Bas-Maine *founk*, *funik* 'ombrageux, sauvage' Dottin gives one example where the word applies to the flight of pigs <sup>4</sup>
- (c) 1 Poitou *frenicle*, adj des 2 genres 'chatouilleux,' par extension 'gai, vif', *frenichou*, adj 'chatouilleux', *frenicleur*, v 'chatouiller' <sup>5</sup>  
2 Poitou *frenicloux* adj 'chatouilleux' Ce mot qui ne s'appliqua d'abord qu'aux chevaux est employé pour les personnes, *frenicler* v n 'se remuer, s'agiter' <sup>6</sup>
- (d) Basse-Gâtine *formicle*, adj des deux genres 'non apprivoisé,' en parlant des animaux, par extension s'applique aux personnes susceptibles <sup>7</sup>

The similarity in meaning between English *funk* and these French patois words, especially *feunIQUE*, *founIQUE*, *funIQUE* (Haut-

<sup>3</sup> R de Montesson, *Vocabulaire du Haut-Maine*, Paris-Le Mans, 1899, pp 261, 272, 279

<sup>4</sup> G Dottin, *Glossaire des parlers du Bas Maine*, Paris, 1910, 212

<sup>5</sup> Lalanne, *Glossaire du patois poitevin*, Poitiers, 1868, *Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*, Vol 32, 140

<sup>6</sup> G Lévrier, *Dictionnaire étymologique du patois poitevin*, Niort, 1867, 112

<sup>7</sup> C Puichard, *Dictionnaire du patois du Bas Gâtinais*, *Revue de philologie française et de littérature*, 1893, 51

Maine) and *founik*, *funik* (Bas-Maine), is at first glance so striking that a relationship seems assured, provided we can explain divergences in form. The fact that the French words are primarily adjectives creates no difficulty. The common origin will show that English *funk* was probably first an adjective.

The *NED* (iv, 608a) lists as follows several *funk* which it separates from *funk* sb.<sup>3</sup> 'cowering fear etc.' and *funk* v.<sup>2</sup> 'to flinch or shrink through fear etc.'

*FUNK* v.<sup>3</sup> Scottish and north app. onomatopoeic *trans* and *intr*. To kick 1709 (The examples given all concern horses.)

*FUNK* sb.<sup>4</sup> Scottish and north 1 A kick 1838 (The examples given all concern horses.) 2 Ill humor, passion

*The Century Dictionary*<sup>8</sup> also lists an adjective *funk* 'cross, ill-tempered,' and Scottish has further a noun *funker* 'a horse or cow that kicks'.<sup>9</sup> These words (the adjective *funk* and the noun *funker*) are quite obviously to be associated with *funk* v.<sup>3</sup> and *funk* sb.<sup>4</sup>

The suggestion of the *NED* that these *funk* (v.<sup>3</sup> and sb.<sup>4</sup>) are "apparently onomatopoeic" is not to be retained. Webster<sup>10</sup> is correct here, although not very positive, when it links these words (*funk* v.<sup>3</sup> and sb.<sup>4</sup>) with *funk* v.<sup>2</sup> 'to flinch or shrink through fear, etc.' (and therefore likewise with *funk* sb.<sup>3</sup> 'cowering fear' etc.) The kick of a horse or cow is most often a manifestation of fear or irritation.<sup>11</sup> In this respect we may compare *funk* v.<sup>3</sup> 'to kick' and *funk* sb.<sup>4</sup> 'a kick,' with certain members of the French patois group which refer specifically to animals (as well as to persons). Bas-Maine *founik*, *funik* 'ombrageux, sauvage' (pigs), Basse-Gâtine *formcle* 'non apprivoisé' (animals in general), Poitou

<sup>8</sup> *The Century Dictionary and Cyclopaedia of the English Language*, New York, 1911, iv, 2412 a

<sup>9</sup> *A Scot's Dialect Dictionary*, London, 1911, p. 196

<sup>10</sup> *Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language*, 1929, 878 a

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the *NED* example of *funk* sb.<sup>4</sup> "He places his hand, unluckily, on the spot where Mr. Pony is rather touchy. Sundry vehement *funks* were the immediate consequence." Cf. also in the *NED* *FUNKY* f. *FUNK* sb.<sup>3</sup> 'In a state of funk,' frightened, nervous, timid, and *FUNKY* f. *FUNK* sb.<sup>4</sup> 'Given to kick as a horse.' In *The Century Dictionary* *FUNKY* applies to both persons and horses. adj. 1 'Kicking, given to kicking as a horse' 2 'Easily angered, touchy,' as does *FUNK* sb.<sup>4</sup>

*frencloux* 'chatouilleux' (horses), *frencler* 'se remuer, s'agiter' (horses).

Granted that these English *funk* (sb<sup>3</sup>, sb<sup>4</sup>, v<sup>2</sup>, v<sup>3</sup>) show close similarity in sense as a group to the family of French patois words (a, b, c<sup>1</sup>, c<sup>2</sup>, d, above), how can the form *funk* be explained and related to them? Before Thomas' research on the origin of the French words, which were first recorded in the second half of the 19th century, there was an even longer gap in their history than in the case of English *funk*, but Thomas bridged it in remarkable fashion.<sup>12</sup> We give here in some detail his etymology of the French patois words, for it is certainly that of *funk*. They are without doubt survivals of Old French *fernicle*, *fornicle*, *fenicle*, *funicle*, of which Godefroy<sup>13</sup> notes a few examples from French medieval literary texts in the sense of 'terrible'. These Old French words do not represent an *\*infernicola* as given by Korting,<sup>14</sup> but says Thomas

Il est plus naturel de penser au grec latinisé *phreneticus* ou *phreneticus* qui a pu être remplacé barbairement par *\*frenicus* (Je note l'emploi concurrent en latin, de *aulicus* et de *auleticus*, bien que le grec ne paraisse posséder que αὐλητικός [dérivé de αὐλός 'flûte' par αὐλητής] car αὐλικός ne s'emploie en grec que comme dérivé de αὐλή 'cour'), dérivé reposant à la fois sur φρήν et sur *frenum*. On sait que dans les mots empruntés par le français, la desinence normale, -ique, -iaque est parfois altérée en -icle, -iacle cf *bouticle*, *onicle*, *soucicle*, *turnicle*, *demonicle*, *tracle*.<sup>15</sup>

English *funk* seems to represent medieval French *funicle* in which the *r* (cf *frenicle*) had already been lost by dissimilation and the *e* (cf *frenicle* and *fenicle*) had been rounded by the influence of the labial, a common phenomenon.<sup>16</sup> Old French *funicle* appears to be also the point of departure for *feunIQUE*, *founIQUE*, *funIQUE* (Haut-Maine) and *founik*, *funik* (Bas-Maine), the latter show the same loss of final unaccented syllable as in English *funk*. It seems probable that *funk* came over early in some form from Western France. Brunot notes that "au normanno-picard importé avec l'in-

<sup>12</sup> A. Thomas, *loc. cit.* (cf note 1 above)

<sup>13</sup> F. Godefroy, *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, Paris, 1881-1902, III, 764 a

<sup>14</sup> *Lateinisch-romantisches Wörterbuch*, 3 Aufl., Paderborn, 1907

<sup>15</sup> Cf. W. Meyer-Lubke, *Rom. Etym. Wörterb.* no 6471, who accepts this etymology and gives other romance derivatives of *phreneticus*

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *fusIQUE*, *fisIQUE*, *funuer*, *femuer*, *fumelle*, *femelle*, *affubler* < *\*AFFIBULARE*.

vasion de Guillaume, s'était superposé au cours du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle un fort élément angevin"<sup>17</sup> The political and economic relations in the 12th and 13th centuries between England and its continental tributaries Anjou, Maine, and Poitou, are too well known to require comment

The medieval French words and the modern French patois words show normal accentuation of the *v* The compression of English *funk* to the exclusion of the *v* is undoubtedly old and is due to the shift of the stress accent to the first syllable, following the system of accentuation in Middle English, to which we know that words borrowed from French were rapidly submitted<sup>18</sup> Furthermore the unrounding of Old French *u* (> *ü*) in Middle English is entirely normal<sup>19</sup>

The French patois group and English *funk* (*sb*<sup>3</sup>, *sb*<sup>4</sup>, *v*<sup>2</sup>, *v*<sup>3</sup>, *adj*) therefore have as etymon, *PHRENETICUS* (φρενιτικός) > \**FRENICUS* and they are closer to it in meaning than are the Old French words (*fernucle*, *formucle*, *fenicle*, *funicle*) attested in medieval literary texts Hence the various *funk*, which we have been considering, should figure in the dictionaries as members of a

<sup>17</sup> Ferd Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*, I, 319 Cf *NED*, I, *General Explanations*, x, note "the Anglo-French dialect of the 14th century was distinct not only from Parisian, but from all dialects of continental French In its origin a mixture of various Norman and other Northern French dialects, afterwards mixed with and greatly modified by Angevin, Parisian, Poitevin and other elements, and more and more exposed to the overpowering influence of literary French, it had yet received, on this side the Channel, a distinct and independent development, following in its phonology especially, English and not continental tendencies" Cf also D Behrens, *Zur Lautlehre der Französischen Lehnwörter im Mittelhochdeutschen*, Heilbronn 1886, pp 2 f, W W Skeat, *English Dialects from the Eighth Century to the Present Day*, Cambridge, 1912, 94

<sup>18</sup> Cf D Behrens, *op cit*, 67 "Vokale der ursprünglichen Hochtonsilbe sind dem Ausfall unterworfen wenn eine derselben unmittelbar vorhergehende Silbe nach germanischer Accenturungsweise den Ton erhält" In addition to the numerous examples, mostly obsolete words, cited by Behrens, we may add modern English *nurse* (F *nourrice*), *lance* (OF *lance*), *furl* (OF *fardel*), *poult* (F *poulet*), *quarl* (OF *quarrel*) and obsolete *foit* (OF *folet*) Cf also *monk* (AS *munuc*, *munec*, L *monachus*), *mint* (AS *mynet*, L *moneta*) The full form of such words often persists, however, or is reintroduced at a later date *Funk* was undoubtedly of purely popular usage from the beginning and found no corrective influences Its first recorded examples (18th century) are colloquial or slang

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.



single etymological family. *Funk* is then the same word, etymologically speaking, as *frantic* (French *frénétique*), whose root (= φρήν) is also found in *frenzy* (French *frénésie* < PHRENESIA, φρενίτις).

*Funk* is undoubtedly one of the sources of the family name *Funk* which is well known on the civil list in England and the United States.<sup>20</sup> It belongs to the category of proper names which express moral qualities and defects and which were for the most part adjectives *Noble, Gay, Curtis (courtous), Jealous, Frank, True*, etc.<sup>21</sup> We have pointed out that *funk* is etymologically an adjective and as such probably existed in Middle English, as it does in fact in the modern language (cf above *funk*, adj 'cross, ill-tempered'). Thomas (*loc cit.*) notes as present day French family names which are survivals of Old French *fernicle Fernicle, Fernique* (add also *Fernag*), and of which *Funk* may be said to be the equivalent in English. *Funk* must have been originally applied to a person who was 'cross, ill-tempered,' or perhaps to one who 'funked,' i. e. a coward

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

---

## THE BASIS OF J-J ROUSSEAU'S CONTEMPORANEOUS REPUTATION IN ENGLAND

The purpose of this article is to add to the light recently thrown on early English opinion of several individual works of Jean Jacques Rousseau by examining the basis of almost all contemporaneous opinion.<sup>1</sup> The sentimental nature of Rousseau's appeal has long been recognized, but the extent and nature of that appeal in eighteenth-century England has not been studied

<sup>20</sup> *Funk*, the family name, has also been attached to obsolete English *funk* 'spark'

<sup>21</sup> Nouns are also sources of proper names of this sort *Joy, Love, Hope*, etc, but the adjective class is far more numerous

<sup>1</sup> See J. H. Warner, "The Reaction in Eighteenth-Century England to Rousseau's two *Discours*," *PMLA*, XLVIII (1933), 471-87, and "Eighteenth-Century English Reactions to the *Nouvelle Héloïse*," *PMLA*, LII (1937), 803-19, R. B. Sewall, "Rousseau's First Discourse in England," *PMLA*, LII (1937), 908-11, "Rousseau's Second Discourse in England from 1755 to 1762," *PQ*, XVII (1938), 97-114, and "Rousseau's Second Discourse in England and Scotland from 1762 to 1772," *PQ*, XVIII (1939), 225-42

We find that both favorable and unfavorable reactions, regardless of the content of the work under consideration, were nearly always elicited by its real or imagined emotional appeal. This was true from the first. The Reverend William Bowyer, translator of the first of Rousseau's well known writings, the *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* (1750), illustrates this by his implicit faith in the power of Rousseau's "oratory," even, as he states, "in the worst of causes." According to him the *Discours* is

one of the finest modern pieces of oratory, and of so dangerous a persuasion, that if the author, instead of giving it in writing, had pronounced it with all the force which the fluency of tongue and the graces of action usually add to such orations in public, I should tremble for all the libraries of Europe, and dread his elocution almost as much as the fire and swords of Goths, Vandals, and Mussulmen.<sup>2</sup>

The response to Rousseau's next important work, the *Discours sur l'origine de l'inégalité* (1755), further exemplifies the emotional appeal of its author, even in his philosophical writings. William Roberts, for example, maintained that they are

not of the dry and factitious sort which consist of cold propositions of ethics and which involve themselves in a labyrinth of logical subtleties, but of that authentic, plain, and practical kind that regulates the feeling while it interests the heart.<sup>3</sup>

James Beattie similarly testified that his heart exulted to contemplate such "sublime and successful efforts of the human intellect."<sup>4</sup> "Radical" Tom Paine found in the *Discours* "a loveliness of sentiment in favor of liberty that excites respect and elevates the human faculties,"<sup>5</sup> while Thomas Day, author of the pedagogical novel, *Sandford and Merton* (1783), dedicated a poem, *The Dying Negro* (1773), to Rousseau as to one

<sup>2</sup> Preface to J-J Rousseau, *A Discourse on the Arts and Sciences*, as translated by the Reverend William Bowyer, London, 1751, and as quoted by John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1812-13, II, 226-27. For other English reactions to the first *Discours* see Warner, *loc cit*, and Sewall, *loc cit*.

<sup>3</sup> See his periodical, *Looker On*, by the Reverend Simon Olive-Branch, London, 1792-93, No. 50 for April 27, 1793.

<sup>4</sup> *An Essay on the Nature and Immutability of Truth* (1770), as quoted in the *Annual Register*, XIV (1771), 256.

<sup>5</sup> *Rights of Man* (1791), in *Works*, New York, 1908, IV, 106.

whose matchless eloquence is less admirable than the fortitude with which he has developed the principles and defended the rights of human nature [and whose] virtuous enthusiasm seems inspired by Heaven itself for the instruction of its creatures <sup>6</sup>

But it was the publication of the sentimental novel, the *Nouvelle Héloïse* (1760), that resulted in the first pronounced widening of Rousseau's fame in England. William Kenrick, the first English translator, cites the opinion of a reviewer in the *Parisian Journal des sçavans*

Who can resist those torrents of pathetic language which penetrate the inmost soul and so tyrannically command our tears, those master strokes of simplicity which open the recesses of the human heart and excite the pleasure of weeping sensibility? <sup>7</sup>

English opinion was more restrained, but, as might be expected, it stressed the emotional appeal. A reviewer for the *London Chronicle* noted immediately that the work contained "pictures of life and manners that speak to the heart and therefore cannot fail to please" <sup>8</sup>. James Beattie decided after a hurried reading of the first volume that Rousseau possessed "great knowledge of the human heart" and that "his sensibility is exquisite, and his eloquence wonderfully affecting" <sup>9</sup>. Another example of a great many similar comments, but one which is unusually analytical, is that of the anonymous author of *Anecdotes of Polite Literature* (1764)

Of all the books I ever read *Julie* is the most pathetic. The whole story of her unsuccessful and unhappy passion is composed of so many moving circumstances, that I could never think of it without emotion. It is an almost continued thread of the true pathetic. The hundred and seventh [letter] is amazingly affecting. No breast, that is not adamant, can be proof against such a melancholy tale. In the seventy-sixth, we see a different species of the pathetic, but equally admirable, after the more passionate ones, it displays a certain calm pathetic, a dignity of distress, that must touch a feeling heart most nearly <sup>10</sup>

<sup>6</sup> London, 1773, pp. III-IV. For further details concerning English reactions to the second *Discours*, see Warner and Sewall as cited in note 1 above.

<sup>7</sup> *Journal des sçavans* (1761), as translated in Kenrick's preface to J.-J. Rousseau, *Eloisa, or a Series of Original Letters*, 2nd ed., London, 1761.

<sup>8</sup> IX (1761), 204.

<sup>9</sup> Letter to Robert Arbuthnot, October 24, 1761 in William Forbes, *An Account of the Life and Writings of James Beattie*, London, 1874, 2 vols., I, 46.

<sup>10</sup> London, 1764, v, 152. For further details concerning the reception accorded the *Nouvelle Héloïse* in England, see Warner, *op cit*, as cited in note 1 above.

Although most critics deplored the moral influence of the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, several passionately exclaimed that it made virtue amiable, and Richard Hurd applauded Rousseau's worship of an almost animate virtue. James Beattie called Rousseau a "moral writer of true genius," as contrasted with Hume and Hobbes. Beattie also exclaimed that Rousseau's sensibility enabled him to "see through moral subjects at a glance," and to satisfy "both the heart and the understanding." Thus Rousseau's insistence on the post-marriage virtue of his heroine did not escape English notice.<sup>11</sup> Very possibly the *Nouvelle Héloïse* (1760) was in the mind of a writer for the *British Magazine* (1761) when he clearly presented the moral and philosophical basis of the English sentimental movement.

The heart, cultivated by precept and warned by example improves in sensibility, which is the foundation of taste. By distinguishing the influence and scope of morality, and cherishing the ideas of benevolence, it [the heart] acquires a habit of sympathy which tenderly feels responsive, like the vibrations of unisons, to every touch of moral beauty. Hence it is that a man of social heart, made tender by the practice of virtue, is waked to the most pathetic emotions by every uncommon instance of generosity and greatness of soul. Is there any man so dead to sentiment, so lost to humanity, as to read unmoved the generous behaviour of the Romans to the states of Greece? Historical knowledge, indeed becomes necessary, but, as the formation of the heart is of the first consequence, and should precede the cultivation of the understanding, such striking instances of superior virtue ought to be culled for the perusal of the young pupil, who will read them with eagerness and revolve them with pleasure. Thus the young mind becomes enamoured of moral beauty, and the passions are lifted on the side of humanity. Virtue and sentiment reciprocally assist each other, and both conduce to the improvement of perception.<sup>12</sup>

Furthermore it is easy to see in any study of Rousseau's reputation the mutual aid of the sentimental and the political movements of the late eighteenth century. Day and Paine, cited above, are only two of many political liberals who welcomed with distinctly "sentimental" phraseology the influence of Rousseau toward freedom and equality.<sup>13</sup> This influence was found to emanate not only

<sup>11</sup> Hurd, "Commonplace Book," *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Right Reverend Richard Hurd*, ed. Rev. Francis Kilvert, London, 1860, pp. 81-82.

<sup>12</sup> *British Magazine or Monthly Repository*, III, 493 (Sept., 1761).

<sup>13</sup> See also William Godwin, *Enquiry Concerning Human Justice* (1793) in *Works*, New York, 1926, I, 95, II, 33-34 n.; James Mackintosh, *Vindiciae Gallicae* (1791) in *Miscellaneous Works*, London, 1851, pp. 139, 589, John

from the two *Discours* but also from *Émile* (1762) and from the *Contrat social* (1762). An amusing incident in the career of Capell Lofft, a vigorous opponent of Burke's views on the French Revolution, will illustrate. Lofft inserted in the *Gentleman's Magazine* (1786) a passionate appeal for nuts or a branch from a walnut tree planted by the youthful Rousseau. He wrote that he wished to plant these beside acorns which grew on the plantation of the "Deliverer of America." An outraged patriot who signed himself "Entre Nous" responded immediately with the assertion that "it would give me pleasure to accommodate him with a few nuts." But the correspondent asserted that "his enthusiasm for this French writer is not yet arrived to the same pitch" as that of Lofft's, and he recommended to Lofft's consideration the royal oak and Shakespeare's mulberry tree. Lofft returned with characteristic force and "sentiment" by asserting that "none ever read Rousseau with *any* pleasure that does not remember him with the *greatest*. The productions of such a mind cannot merely and coldly be found agreeable. They either enrapture, or they cannot be felt." Lofft then continued to hail Rousseau as the "eloquent asserter of the primary and equal rights of humanity," and as "the deliverer of the human mind from many degrading prejudices destructive of political and private happiness."<sup>14</sup>

Naturally, sentimental phraseology was comparatively infrequent in English comment on the pedagogical theories of *Émile* (1762), but several passionate excerpts were translated for the *London Chronicle* (1762) under the heading of "Beauties."<sup>15</sup> Many of these presented Rousseau's position on religion under the title of "Profession de foi du vicaire Savoyard," an example of which is the following emotional comment on the Bible and on the character of Jesus:

What gentleness and purity in his manners! What mildness and affecting grace in his instructions! What elevation and dignity in his maxims! What deep wisdom in his discourses! What presence of mind, what delicacy, what precision in his answers to the demands of the ignorant or the

---

Payne, *Journal during a Residence in France* (1794), as quoted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXXIV (1794), 359, and Capell Lofft, *Remarks on the Letter of Mr Burke to a Member of the National Assembly* (1790) as quoted in the *Analytical Review*, XI (1791), 515-20.

<sup>14</sup> See the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LVI (1786), 744, 935, LVII (1787), 395-96.

<sup>15</sup> XII, 4, 27, 279, 291-92, 299, 307-08, 316.

objections of the perverse! What an amazing empire over his passions did his whole conduct and conversation discover! Where is the man, where is the sage that has so far attained the perfection of wisdom and virtue as to live, act, suffer, and die without weakness on the one hand, or ostentation on the other? That sage was Christ. I acknowledge at the same time that the majesty of the Scriptures fills me with a solemn kind of astonishment, and that the sanctity of the Gospel speaks in a powerful and commanding language to the feelings of the heart.<sup>16</sup>

Emile's ideal mate was presented in Sophie, a representative of the clinging, dependent type of womanhood. Mary Wollstonecraft, often called the promulgator of the modern feminist movement, laid the blame for this, as well as all other mistakes in Rousseau's thinking, on his sentimental nature. In her own words, "all Rousseau's errors in reasoning arose from sensibility, and sensibility to their charms women are ever ready to forgive."<sup>17</sup>

That the latter statement is true may be illustrated in the fact that Rousseau was considerably more popular among British women than among British men. Alicia Cockburn was representative of Anna Seward, Eliza Roberts, Mary Dewes, Kitty Hunter, the Duchess of Portland, and others when she passionately invited Rousseau to Scotland. "O bring him with you," she wrote to David Hume in 1766, "the English are not worthy of him. Sweet old man, he shall sit beneath an oak and hear the Druid's songs."<sup>18</sup>

Many Englishmen met Rousseau personally, both on the continent and in England, and learned at first hand of Rousseau's emotional nature. In line with his custom of interviewing the great, Boswell met Rousseau in 1764 and became maudlin in his praise of the Genevan's insight and sensibility.

My idea of you is this: aside from the unknowable essence of the human heart, you have a perfect knowledge of all the principles of body and mind, their actions, their sentiments, in short, of whatever they can accomplish or acquire in the way of influence over man. Your writings, Sir, have softened my heart, raised my spirits, and kindled my imagination. . . . Pardon me, Sir, but I am moved! I can no longer restrain myself. O beloved St. Preux! Inspired Mentor! Eloquent and amiable Rousseau!<sup>19</sup>

<sup>16</sup> *London Chronicle*, XII (1762), 279.

<sup>17</sup> *Vindication of the Rights of Women*, 2nd ed., London, 1792, p. 202.

<sup>18</sup> *Letters of Eminent Persons Addressed to David Hume*, Edinburgh, 1849, pp. 123-25, 129. For further presentation of this point, see Warner, "Nouvelle Héloïse," *op. cit.*, p. 811, n. 41.

<sup>19</sup> Letter of Boswell to Rousseau, December 3, 1764, in *Letters of James Boswell*, ed. Tinker, Oxford, 1924, I, 60.

When Rousseau fled to England in 1766 under the protection of the Scottish philosopher, David Hume, London papers reported a statement of Rousseau that Garrick's acting had made him both laugh and weep although he had not understood a word that was spoken. At first Rousseau was profuse in his gratitude to Hume, but soon the papers were filled with accounts of the quarrel between Hume and his guest. According to the most widely accepted version, Rousseau became suspicious when he heard Hume cry out in his sleep, "Ah! I have him now, this Jean Jacques!"<sup>20</sup> Hume analyzed the hypersensitive character of Rousseau as follows:

I foresee that he [Rousseau] will be unhappy in that situation [at Wootton, Derbyshire], as he has, indeed, been in all situations. He has read very little during the course of his life, and he has now totally renounced all reading. He has seen very little, and he has no manner of curiosity to see or remark. He has reflected, properly speaking, and studied very little, and he has not indeed much knowledge. He has only *felt* during the whole course of his life, and, in this respect, his sensibility rises to a pitch beyond what I have seen any example of, but it still gives him a more acute feeling of pain than of pleasure. He is like a man who were stript not only of his clothes, but of his skin, and turned out in that situation to combat with the rude and boisterous elements, such as perpetually disturb this lower world.<sup>21</sup>

Later Hume joined many other prominent English writers in realizing that Rousseau's extreme sensitivity amounted to mental derangement.<sup>22</sup> Today Rousseau would probably be classed as a paranoiac for he had in extreme form both the persecution complex

<sup>20</sup> See "An Account of the late David Hume," in *Town and Country Magazine*, VIII (1776), 463. For full details of Rousseau's English visit, see L. J. Courtois, "Le séjour de Jean-Jacques Rousseau en Angleterre," *Annales de la société Jean Jacques Rousseau*, VI (1910), 1-313. For the details of the Hume-Rousseau quarrel, see Margaret Hill, "La querelle Rousseau-Hume," in the *Annales*, XVIII (1927-28), 1-331.

<sup>21</sup> Letter of March 25, 1766, as quoted in J. H. Burton, *Life and Correspondence of David Hume*, Edinburgh, 1846, 2 vols., II, 314.

<sup>22</sup> See Hume's letter to Richard Davenport, July 1, 1767 in Courtois, *op cit*, VI (1910), 314; Thomas Gray, letter to the Rev. James Brown, June 6, 1767, in *Works*, ed. Gosse, III, 271; Bishop Hurd, "Parallel of Petrarch and Rousseau" (n.d.), in *Memoirs of Hurd*, ed. Kilvert, London, 1860, pp. 345-48; James Boswell, letter to W. J. Temple, February 1, 1767, in *Letters of James Boswell to W. J. Temple*, London, 1857, pp. 74-75; Horace Walpole, letter to the Reverend William Cole, January 18, 1766, in *Letters of Horace Walpole*, ed. Toynbee, VI, 398.

and an abnormal sense of uniqueness and personal grandeur Walpole cruelly inserted an advertisement in the papers over the name of the King of Prussia inviting Rousseau to visit his court where any form and amount of persecution could be secured. English periodicals also noted that Rousseau deposited his writings for safe-keeping under the altar of Notre Dame and that he declared that on Judgment Day, with a copy of the *Confessions* in his hand, he could claim superiority over all <sup>23</sup>

After the death of Rousseau in 1778 and the publication of the posthumous *Confessions* (1782), newspapers carried sentimental descriptions of the tomb among the poplars at Ermenonville <sup>24</sup> Lady Wentworth gave, even to the redoubtable critic of Rousseau, Hannah More, "a pretty French snuff box on which is the tomb of Rousseau in the isle of poplars" <sup>25</sup> And naturally the passing of the years caused the sentimentalists, particularly in France, to forget the weaknesses of "the wild philosopher of Geneva," a term often applied to Rousseau <sup>26</sup> For example, note the passionate and colorful metaphors of this glowing retrospect from the *Journal de Paris* as translated in the *Universal Magazine* (1788)

A flame, now devouring like those of the tropics, now soft as the genial rays of the blushing morn, now melancholy, now tender and affecting as the fair beams of the Cynthian goddess, inflamed the enraptured soul with the holy enthusiasm of virtue, and cast over morality the attracting colours of voluptuousness The country smiled with such bewitching charms that man longed to partake of rural toils and sports At the appearance of this powerful flame, soon vanished barbarous prejudice, the origin of bondage and tyranny The unnatural shackles that confined children were broken with the chains that enthralled the mind, Heaven, and the august countenance of the Almighty, stood then confessed before astonished man, who

---

<sup>23</sup> See Walpole, *loc cit*, and Courtois, *op cit*

<sup>24</sup> For example, see *London Chronicle*, LVIII (1785), 453, "A Tour to Ermenonville (1785)," as quoted in *Monthly Review*, LXXIV (1786), 132-35, "Account of the Circumstances Which Attended the Death of Rousseau," *European Magazine*, IX (1786), 110-11, 155-56, *Universal Magazine*, XCIII (1793), 321-24, *Anthologia Hibernica*, IV (1794), 275-79, 335-36

<sup>25</sup> Letter of Hannah More to her sister Martha in May, 1783, *Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs Hannah More*, ed Roberts, 3rd ed., London, 1835, I, 281

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, letter of Richard Davenport to David Hume, May 13, 1767, in J L Burton, *Life of Hume*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1846, II, 367, and Boswell, *Journal of a Tour to Corsica*, London, 1879, p 140



became good, humane, and happy in the charming visions of hope With Rousseau's breath the fostering name abated <sup>27</sup>

Finally we should note that the emotional power of Rousseau's style was recognized by both friends and foes even during the last decade of the eighteenth century when, although his fame was wider than ever before, his reputation was lower <sup>28</sup> Epithets applied to the style of Rousseau in both favorable and unfavorable criticisms include such terms as "eloquent," "glowing," "fervid," and "pathetic" Adam Smith, famous author of *The Wealth of Nations* (1776), asserted that it was by the help of such a sentimental appeal, together with "a little philosophical casuistry," that Rousseau was enabled to make the "principles and ideas of the profligate Mandeville seem . . . to have all the purity and morals of Plato" <sup>29</sup> The *Monthly Review*, inclined to be favorable to Rousseau, admitted that the *Confessions* (1782) showed Rousseau's heart "to be the repository of every affection that can exalt or degrade human nature," and that "sometimes he appeared to be brave, collected, and undaunted, at other times he sunk into the most contemptible pusillanimity" <sup>30</sup> Burke's well-known charge was that Rousseau was afflicted by vanity and a sentimentalism that upsets the normal scale of morals, but Burke admitted that "Thousands admire the sentimental writer! The affectionate father is hardly known in his parish" <sup>31</sup> And the wide-spread opposition of the religiously orthodox may be represented by the Reverend Thomas Rennell who perhaps exaggerated the power of Rousseau's sentimental appeal as follows

The purest philanthropy is the profession of this writer, but the real purpose and effect of his writings is to diffuse a principle of sentimental profligacy and canting libertinism, and yet, notwithstanding the enervating languor of his style, and the meanness and pooriness of his artifices, his

---

<sup>27</sup> LXXXII (1788), 263

<sup>28</sup> See notes 31, 32 below, Warner, "Reaction to Rousseau's two *Discours*," *op cit*, p 483, and Warner, "A Bibliography of Eighteenth-Century English Editions of J-J Rousseau, with Notes on the Early Diffusion of his Writings," *PQ*, XII (1934), 231-32

<sup>29</sup> "Letter to the Authors of the *Edinburgh Review*," *Edinburgh Review* for 1755, 2nd ed., London, 1818, pp 130-34

<sup>30</sup> LXIX (1783), 150-51

<sup>31</sup> *Letter to a Member of the National Assembly* (1791), in *Works*, London, 1891-94, II, 536-38

influence over the minds and habits of his age has been stupendous. Those whose principles have been proof against the acuteness of Hobbes, the subtlety of Hume, the bombast of Gibbon, and the buffoonery of Voltaire, have fallen before the effeminate and factitious tenderness of Rousseau.<sup>22</sup>

But perhaps the most complete example of the diction and viewpoint of the sentimentalists in their reaction to Rousseau was given by Richard Fellowes in 1799 shortly after he had taken his A. B. at Oxford in theology and had expressed his opposition to Calvinism and supernaturalism. Under the heading "Character of Rousseau" in the *Monthly Mirror* (1799), Fellowes agreed with Burke that Rousseau was not a philanthropist, but he praised Rousseau's style highly.

Every page of Rousseau glows with the captivations of that sentimental luxury of which he is so great a master, and which he arrays in all the blandishments of eloquence. Hence the source of that admiration which his writings have so universally excited. Though his judgment as a philosopher was not so profound, yet [sic] his taste was so exquisite that he strews flowers in the most rugged way, and interests the passions and the fancy in the investigation of the most abstract propositions. This is his great excellence.

In his *New Elise*, the interest consists, not so much in the diversity or the combination of the incidents, as in the beauty of the sentiment and the magic of the diction.

His *Emulus*, though marked by the illuminating touches and the original conceptions of genius, considered as a system is more conspicuous for its singularity than its truth.

Though Rousseau had little beneficence, yet his writings, breathing nothing but the reciprocal love and kindness and confidence of the golden age, contributed, by their wide diffusion and their enchanting eloquence, to render humanity fashionable.

The extreme and febrile sensibility, which was the characteristic peculiarity of Rousseau, while it proved the origin of many of his miseries, was, perhaps, a principal source of his greatness. In some intervals of insanity he exhibited the melancholy prospect of genius crumbling into ruins.

The language of Rousseau was always a faithful mirror of what was passing in his heart, which now thrilled with rapture, and now raged with passion. Of his style the peculiar characteristic is exuberance of imagery, profusion, without distinction of lustre. He who wishes to perfect himself in those delicacies of language, or curious felicities of phraseology which impress a palpable form, a living entity, on the fleeting tints and

---

<sup>22</sup> Sermon of 1793 as quoted in the *Gentleman's Magazine*, LXIII (1793), 255-56.

sensations of the heart, should carefully analyze the genius of the style of Rousseau <sup>22</sup>

Thus it is clear that the heart of Rousseau's contemporary appeal in England was his sentimentality. Fellowes was only one of many who disapproved of Rousseau's theories but applauded his emotional style. Criticism of his works, regardless of content, was almost invariably not only couched in sentimental phraseology but emphatic in acknowledging the power of Rousseau's "glowing" style. The personal sensitivity of Rousseau was also frequently noted. The marked effect of his sentimental works, with their emphasis upon a widening of human emotions, can easily be seen in the comment of several liberals, especially Thomas Day, William Godwin, and Capell Lofft. The mutual aid thus rendered between the sentimental and social movements of the day is obvious, but English comment to that effect in reviews of Rousseau's works was comparatively rare. Perhaps the critics were too close to the scene. So perhaps we should not attempt to decide whether a similar insistence today upon the "education of the heart" would merely result in what Howard Mumford Jones aptly calls "relief from murder" or extend further into unhealthy affectation, as Irving Babbitt suggests.

JAMES H. WARNER

*Hope College  
Holland, Mich*

#### WAS THERE A MEISTERSINGERSCHULE AT DANZIG?

This seems to be quite a moot question. The authoritative work on the subject says "The existence of Meistergesang in certain cities is maintained by one, disputed by another. Meistersinger are said to have practiced their art at Danzig and even to have given plays there—which bespeaks the existence of an organized group—but Danzig is remote from their sphere of influence, and the evidence is vague and conflicting. It remains uncertain, for example, whether Hans Pantzer really came from Danzig. There is probably better reason for believing that he belonged to the school at Augsburg" <sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> VIII (1799), 71-72. For other reactions to the style of Rousseau, see Warner, "*Nouvelle Héloïse*," *op cit*, LII, 812-13.

<sup>23</sup> Professor Archer Taylor, *Literary History of Meistergesang* N. Y., Oxford Univ. Press, 1937, p. 18.

The matter of Danzig, then, stands out as far more interesting and important than that of other towns concerning which there is uncertainty. Its isolation far to the north makes it a unique case. If the evidence for a Danzig school falls, a sweeping generalization can be made concerning concentration of the movement in central and Southern Germany. But if the evidence stands, we have in Danzig an exception which gives quite a different aspect to our literary geography, and which may well have a decided effect upon our sociological interpretations.

As early as 1811 Jacob Grimm, in his *Über den altdeutschen Meistergesang*, names Danzig as the site of a school (p. 129). Since Grimm numerous writers have made the same statement, borrowing uncritically from one another. Still others have expressed their doubt or have indicated a negative attitude. No less an authority than Wolfgang Stammeler appears to have reversed himself on the matter, for in his *Wurzeln des Meistergesangs* he speaks of "die merkwürdige Tatsache, dass in Norddeutschland keine Meistersingerzunft bestanden ausser Danzig,"<sup>2</sup> while in his more recently prepared literary map in the *Deutscher Kulturatlas*, showing the geographical distribution of *Meistergesang*, he omits Danzig and makes the specific statement "In Norddeutschland haben sie nie Boden gefunden, weder in Magdeburg noch in Danzig lässt sich eine feste Schule nachweisen."<sup>3</sup> In view of such prevailing uncertainty, and in view of the uniqueness of Danzig's position, it seems worth while to review the available evidence.

The one known creative personality that comes into question is the *Meistersinger* Hans Pantzer (Bantzer) mentioned by Taylor above. Pantzer was a furrier, a native of Augsburg. There is no biographical material available concerning him beyond the brief entry furnished by Roethe in the *A. D. B.* (xxv, 131). Roethe doubts Pantzer's residence at Danzig. He lists him, to be sure, as "Kurschner und Meistersinger in Danzig oder Augsburg, erfand und komponierte die zwangigzeilige neue Junglingsweise", but he continues. "Dass Augsburgs berühmter Dichter, Mag. Joh. Spreng

<sup>2</sup> *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift f. Literaturwissenschaft*, 1923 I, 551.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. Ludtke und Mackensen, 1928-1936 II, No. 158, III, No. 241, cf. also his categorical statement in Merker u. Stammeler, *Reallexikon* (Berlin, 1931 IV, 60, s. v. "Meistergesang"). "Und in Danzig, dem immer eine Meistersingerzunft untergeschoben wird, schweigen alle Urkunden."

(† 1601) diese Form alsbald benutzte, mag für Ansässigkeit in Augsburg zeugen Gedichte Pantzers sind aus den Jahren 1583 bis 1596 erhalten" The *Meisterlieder* referred to are preserved in the manuscript collections at Vienna, Gottweil, Dresden, Breslau, and Jena

The archives of Danzig resolve all doubts concerning Pantzer's residence in favor of Danzig According to Bolte, entry of his name in the Danzig *Bürgerbuch* attests his assumption of citizenship there under date of May 4, 1585<sup>4</sup> If Roethe's dates are dependable, the earliest of Pantzer's *Meisterlieder* (1583) were written at Augsburg<sup>5</sup> The others were composed during the ten or eleven years following his migration to Danzig Pantzer is casually named again in the Danzig records, as late as 1611 In that year he, along with several other members of the furrier guild—all of them apparently local men—applied to the town council for and received permission for the staging of a comedy And when the actors failed to get their play ready in time for the authorized Fastnacht period, they let the program rest over and carried it out the following year We may thus consider it established that Pantzer's sojourn at Danzig was extended rather than fleeting

An important bit of contemporary evidence concerning *Meistergesang* activities at Danzig is cited by Uhland in his *Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage*<sup>6</sup> It is a stanza of a *Meistergesang* which was composed and sung in Strassburg (composer unnamed) in the year 1597

Noch sind vor der zeit  
in der welt weit  
herrlich dichter gewesen,  
findt man ir nam bereit

---

<sup>4</sup> *Danziger Theater im 16 u 17 Jahrhundert* Hamburg, 1895 p 10 In *Theatergeschichtliche Forschungen* Hrsg B Litzmann, xii

<sup>5</sup> That Pantzer was at one time a member of the Augsburg school is confirmed by the *Verzeichnis der Augsburger Meistersinger des XVI Jahrhunderts* (ed Fr Keinz München, F Straub 1893, p 11). This Register, headed "Volgen hernach Die Singer so gewesen sind von 1535 Jarn an biss auf dato," carries as No 145 the name Hans Banczer, a "crowned" singer (*gekront* = *bei einem Preussingen ausgezeichnet*)

<sup>6</sup> *Op cit*, Stuttgart, 1866 p 295 f, found by him in the *Historische Merkwürdigkeiten des ehemaligen Elsasses aus den Silbermannschen Schriften gezogen*

Noch leben heut  
 zu Leipzig und zu Dresden,  
 zu Essling, Nordling, Wien, Breslau,  
 zu Danzig, Basel, Steier,  
 zu Colmar, Frankfurt, Hagenau,  
 im römischen reich zu Speier,  
 Weissenburg gleich  
 Pforzheim ist reich  
 an dichter, wie wir lesen <sup>7</sup>

To be sure, the reference to Danzig might conceivably be merely a recognition of Pantzer's known poetic activity during the decade prior to this time, however the fact that Danzig is paralleled with recognized centers of *Meistergesang* activity implies something more. Exigencies of form rather than untrustworthiness of information doubtless account for the poet's strange omission of reference to Nurnberg and Augsburg, or again it is not impossible that these strongholds of school activity are mentioned in other stanzas of the *Meisterlied* which Uhland does not give. With reference to this poem Nadler says, speaking of the furrier guild at Danzig "Sie waren es, die die Meistersingerschulen hielten, von der 1597 gesprochen wird, aber die Mitglieder waren fast durchwegs Augsburger und Nurnberger" <sup>8</sup> Kurt Unold, who in his *Zur Soziologie des (zunftigen) deutschen Meistergesangs*, names the important schools together with their date of founding, lists Danzig as of the year 1597, but he is evidently referring to the date of the composition of the Strassburg *Meisterlied* <sup>9</sup>

Johannes Bolte, in his monograph cited above, has made a painstaking study of the records of Danzig, and presents pertinent evidence from the town archives. He tells us specifically that the Danzig records fail to document the existence and activity of any *Meistersingerschule*. In the records of early dramatic activity in the town, the furrier guild plays a prominent part, along with other guilds, the schools, etc. In 1572, the furriers staged Johannes

<sup>7</sup> Cf Schnorr von Carolsfeld *Zur Geschichte des deutschen Meistergesangs* Berlin, 1872 p 1, W Nagel "Studien zur Geschichte der Meistersänger" In *Musikalisches Magazin*, Heft 27 Langensalza, 1904 p 113

<sup>8</sup> *Literalurgeschichte der deutschen Stamme u Landschaften*, Regensburg, 1913 II, 56

<sup>9</sup> *Op cit*, Heidelberg, Diss 1932 p 17

Agricola's *Tragedia Johannes Hus* In 1579, a "Kurschnergesell und Marxbruder Jacob Kreiser aus Danzig" presented a poem of his own composition at a *Fechtschule* held in Nurnbeig.<sup>10</sup> In 1594, the furriers of Danzig played a comedy (title slightly garbled) thought to have been Hans Sachs' *Comedi die trewen gesellen und bruder, zweier konig son, Olwer vnd Artus*. And again in 1612, Hans Pantzer participating, the furriers staged the *Comedia von den Sechs Kempfern der Stat Roma und Alba*, by the Augsburg Meistersinger Georg Danbeck. Bolte cites Loschin's *Geschichte Danzigs* (I, 354) to indicate that an Augsburg furrier held a *Fechtschule* in Danzig in 1620, fifteen local members of the Brotherhood of St Markus participating. Whether the program included literary features is not indicated. And, finally, there is a brief item in Bolte concerning one Salomon Schonwalt, "Schuster und Liebhaber der Singekunst". Schonwalt seems, like Pantzer, to have wandered to Danzig from the South, and to have acquired citizenship (1578). His live interest in *Meistergesang* is attested by the fact that he had a collection of *Meisterlieder* prepared for him by the famed *Meistersinger* Adam Puschmann (1532-1600) of Breslau, shoemaker and disciple of Hans Sachs. This manuscript, containing 137 numbered pages, is preserved at Dresden as M 109. A Vorrede (dated 1584) contains the passage "Durch Adam Puschmann zu Breslau colligret und geschrieben auf unkosten,

<sup>10</sup> Bolte cites this evidence from Wassmannsdorf *Sechs Fechtschulen der Marxbruder und Federfechter*, 1870 p 10. The *Marxbruder* were an organization of swordsmen, named after St Markus of Lowenberg, of Frankfurt a M. The *Veisbruder*, known also as *Federfechter*, were a similar fencing society, whose members were authorized to wear a sword at the side and a feather in the hat. This plebeian interest in swordsmanship reflecting the citizen's surviving interest in the customs of knighthood, touched elbows with his interest in *Meistergesang*. As is well known, the latter, tracing its origins from *Minnesang*, is also a harking back to the practices of chivalry on the literary side. The *Meistersinger* often adopted the terminology of knighthood, styling their singing contests tournaments, at which the contestants jousted for the prize. A wreath was hung out as the emblem of battle, and with the wreath the victor was crowned. A particularly skilful phrase of *Meistergesang* was called a *Schirmschlag*, and the *Schuld* and *Schwert* of song were spoken of. In some manuscripts even Hans Sachs is referred to as "ein Fechter," and again as an "approbiert fechtmeister" cf August Hartmann *Deutsche Meisterlieder-Handschriften in Ungarn*. Munchen, 1894. pp 39 ff.

verlegung und anordnung Salomon Schonwalt, Schustern und Mitburgern, auch Liebhabern der Singekunst in Danzig" <sup>11</sup>

This completes the evidence. It is clear, then, that during the last decades of the sixteenth and the first decades of the seventeenth-century, when *Meistergesang* was well on the way to its decline, definite threads of influence ran from Augsburg and Nurnberg to Danzig. Attracted doubtless by the imports of fur that came down the Baltic from Scandinavia and Russia, the furriers of the South, in particular, knew the paths to the port on the northern coast. They and other guildsmen carried with them their enthusiasm for *Meistergesang* and for the dramatic activities of their home guilds, with which they maintained intercourse. Although no record of the existence of a school of *Meistergesang* has been found in the chronicles of Danzig, there seems definitely to have been for some decades a nucleus of such guild activity there. Not only are the names of two resident *Meistersinger*, and their manuscripts, preserved to us, but direct recognition of the group seems implied in the poem by the contemporary *Meistersinger* at Strassburg. The dramatic activity of the group, of necessity involving co-operation and organization, is a matter of record. It was not, however, an indigenous activity at Danzig, but only an imported interest, and one which never took firm root in the northern town.

CLAIR HAYDEN BELL

*The University of California, Berkeley*

---

## THE CONCLUSION OF KELLER'S GRUNER HEINRICH

The suggestion that the conclusion of *Der grune Heinrich*, by Gottfried Keller, means a complete union of Heinrich and Judith, will be emphatically rejected by everyone who knows the problem, because the literary historians seem to agree that this conclusion means complete renunciation.

H. Maync asserts: the poet "lasst Judith schwesterlich sein Leben

<sup>11</sup> Bolte, *op cit*, p 10, Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *op cit*, p 9, Edmund Goetze. "Monographie uber den Meistersanger Adam Puschmann" In *Neues Lausitzisches Magazin*, No 53, 1877 p 75



teilen" <sup>1</sup> Scherer-Walzel has "Ihm steht, nur als Freundin, nicht als Lebensgefährtin, die Frau zur Seite, die in seiner Jugend seine Sinne betört hatte" <sup>2</sup> Nadler is as explicit "Der Held wurde mit der in der Fremde gelauterten Jugendgeliebten zu entsagender Freundschaft zusammengebracht" <sup>3</sup>

Apparently Fernand Baldensperger's expression of doubt has passed unheeded "dans une amitié qui a quelque chose d'un peu obscur" <sup>4</sup> Baldensperger knew however what he was saying, for he was not only acquainted with a similar judgment by Otto Brahm, but also with Keller's own rejection of that judgment Keller had written

Brahm nennt das Verhältnis zur Judith am Schlusse ein unklares, dies allerdings, weil er es wahrscheinlich nicht begreift <sup>5</sup>

Otto Brahm, on the other hand, in his later monograph on Keller, did not find anything obscure, but simply stated that Judith becomes Heinrich's "Lebensgenossin" <sup>6</sup> He was followed in this by Otto Stoessl, but in a verbose manner

Das kraftige, jung gebliebene, reife Weib dem reinen aber vertieften und vom Leben durchgluhten Mann zu einer freien, kühnen, ersten und treuen Gemeinschaft der Geschicke <sup>7</sup>

It is not pleasant to find oneself in the company of Stoessl, but possibly he—in opposition to the best literary historians—was right after all What led those historians to *their* interpretation, was perhaps less the text of the novel than the text of Keller's correspondence Keller begins to speak about the conclusion on June 4, 1876 <sup>8</sup> It is a problem to him He even contemplates a marriage between Heinrich and Judith, but thinks it unbecoming in view of the elegiac first version On March 30, 1877, we have a statement

<sup>1</sup> Harry Maync, *G Keller Ein Abriss* (1923), p 72

<sup>2</sup> Scherer-Walzel, *Gesch d dt Lit* (1928), p 599

<sup>3</sup> J Nadler, *Literaturgeschichte*, iv (1932), p 808

<sup>4</sup> F Baldensperger, *G Keller* (1899), p 153

<sup>5</sup> *G Kellers Briefe und Tagebücher 1861-1890*, ed E Ermatinger (1919), p 346 (letter to Storm, April 21, 1881)

<sup>6</sup> O Brahm, *G Keller Ein literarischer Essay* (1883), p 41

<sup>7</sup> O Stoessl, *G Keller* (1904), p 37

<sup>8</sup> "Verheiraten und behaglich werden lassen kann ich den Armsten jetzt nicht mehr, es würde das vielleicht einen komischen Effekt machen und vielleicht gerade bei den Freunden ein gemütliches Gelächter hervorrufen" *Briefe*, p 171

full of implications.<sup>9</sup> Keller thinks it fit to lead love affairs to a point where the reader should be able to construct the rest by inference. We would not hesitate to apply this striking remark to the end of *Der grüne Heinrich*, if there were not two statements of November 1, 1880, which explicitly contain the words "resignation" and "renounce."<sup>10</sup>

Therefore, the question cannot be solved from the correspondence. There is evidence for both interpretations. Besides, we could not rely exclusively on the correspondence,<sup>11</sup> "anstatt das jetzige Buch aus sich heraus zu beurteilen," as Keller said on November 21, 1880.<sup>12</sup>

Everybody knows that in the first half of the novel Judith represents nature, naturalness, common sense, health, and sensuality. It is as a Pomona that she appears to Heinrich the first time. At her reappearance she has not lost all her attributes, she still is Nature personified, as Keller himself comments on April 21, 1881:

Judith spricht ihn frei als die personifizierte Natur selbst (sie scheint sich von der Wand des Berges abzulösen, aus derselben hervorzukommen).<sup>13</sup>

The text is as clear.

Jugendglück, Heimat, Zufriedenheit, alles schien mir seltsamerweise mit Judith zurückgekehrt, oder vielmehr wie aus dem Berge herausgewachsen zu sein.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> "Das Liebeswesen jedoch für sich betrachtet, so halte ich es für das vorgerücktere Alter nicht mehr recht angemessen, auf dergleichen eingehend zu verweilen, und jene Form der Novelle für besser, wo die Dinge herbeigeführt und alsdann sich selbst überlassen werden, vorausgesetzt, dass doch genugsam zwischen den Zeilen zu lesen sei." *Briefe*, p. 205.

<sup>10</sup> "dass ich die Judith noch etwas jünger gemacht, um die Resignation, die schliesslich gepredigt wird, auch noch ein bisschen der Muhe wert erscheinen zu lassen."

"Damit nun aber nicht ein zu grosses Gutlichtun und Wohlleben entstehe, entsagen die beiden, und es bleibt ein ernst gehaltener Stimmungston bestehen." *Briefe*, p. 321.

<sup>11</sup> The difference between the equivocal correspondence and the outspoken novel is curiously expressed in the use of two different words for one and the same thing. In the correspondence Keller says (June 25, 1878, p. 247) "Und er hat ihr auch immer *im Sinne* gesteckt." In the novel, however, Judith says "Du liegst mir einmal *im Blut*" (*Ges. Werke*, ed. Enders (Reclam, 1922) II, 512).

<sup>12</sup> *Briefe*, p. 324.

<sup>13</sup> *Briefe*, p. 346.

<sup>14</sup> *Werke*, II, 508.

That Heinrich thinks love still possible between them, is implied in the words

Und doch war mir weder Freundschaft noch Liebe zwischen ihr und mir denkbar, wenn sie nicht alles wusste<sup>15</sup>

Their relation enters into its final stage, when Heinrich after his confessions exclaims

"Du hast mich erlost, Judith,            dafür bin ich dein, solange ich lebe!"

The naturalness (contrary to any conventionality) of their relation is forecast in Judith's words

"Unter Gottes freiem Himmel wollen wir unsere Sachen zu Ende fuhren"

The tone of resignation is certainly not carried on in the quaint verses with the anaphora of "Hoffnung"

Hoffnung senket ihren Grund  
In das Herz, nicht in den Mund

There follows the last scene, where Judith declares that they should not marry

"Nun konnten wir uns zu Mann und Frau machen            Wir wollen jener Krone entsagen und dafür des Glückes umso sicherer bleiben, das uns jetzt beseligt"

On his disapproval, she adds:

"Wo du bist, da werde ich auch sein, solange du allein bleibst            Was wollen wir denn mehr?"

And Heinrich

"Ich habe ja gesagt, ich sei dein, und will es auf jede Art sein, wie du es willst"

This sentence, if spoken by the woman, would leave no doubt. But with a shift to the other sex, peculiar to Keller (in practically all his novelettes it is the woman who decides, the man who yields see especially *Romeo und Julia*, *Kleider machen Leute*) we are thrown back into perplexity, which can only be removed by a sentence as strong as the following

Sie schloss mich heftig in die Arme und an ihre gute Brust, auch kusste sie mich zärtlich auf den Mund und sagte leise "Nun ist der Bund besiegelt! Aber für dich nur auf Zusehen hin, du bist und sollst sein ein freier Mann in jedem Sinne"

---

<sup>15</sup> *Werke*, II, 511

Here we need no psychology, no physiology, no reflection that a woman of thirty-five talks to a man of thirty, we need only philology, that is, faithfulness to the text. The superlative artist that Keller was, does not bring in a woman's "Arme" and "gute Brust" and "Mund" and "Heftigkeit" and "Zartlichkeit" to initiate a platonic friendship. Those things may sometimes be negligible quantities, but they are not in a concluding paragraph of Keller.

The traditional interpretation sounds like one "ad usum Delphini." One should not go so far as to superimpose an idea foreign to the text. Only two attitudes are possible: either to accept the non-platonic implications of the text (which do leave room for renunciation, especially on the part of Judith)—or to be content to stop where Keller did, with the bare suggestion that thereafter the two lived near each other.

NORBERT FURST

*St. Louis, Mo*

---

## A PARASITICAL FORM OF BIOGRAPHY

In the eighteenth century biography assumes a new function that connects it, obviously if somewhat mechanically, with the drama. The titles of current plays make up a roll call of antique Romans and exotic monarchs, in their search for subjects of heroic mold the dramatists frequently went far afield. Consequently brief biographies of the heroes of the new plays were in some demand. Each new play on a historical subject stood a good chance of calling forth its ancillary life. "As the Town has been so agreeably entertain'd with the Tragedy of Mustapha," says one biographer,<sup>1</sup> "written by the celebrated Author of Eurydice, and other valuable Pieces [David Mallet], I think it will not be amiss to give a short Account of the Life and Actions of Solyman, the Father of Mustapha." Another nameless writer is specific regarding the functions of this definite type of biography. The following sheets, he writes,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "The History of the Life and Death of Sultan Solyman the Magnificent," 1739.

<sup>2</sup> "The History of Herod and Mariamne, Collected and Compil'd from the best Historians, and serving to illustrate the Fable of Mr [Elijah] Fenton's Tragedy of that Name," 1723, 2d ed., pp. 3-5.

were penn'd with a peculiar View to that Part of the Town who are People of Pleasure and Favouers of the Theatre

But as Dramatick Writers are, by the Rules of their Art, confin'd to a single Action, and the whole Drift of the Scene is to be directed to that One Point, there are many Circumstances of Story, which they are either oblig'd to touch but lightly, or absolutely to throw into Shade In this Case, Recourse is to be had to History, and, to satisfy the Curiosity of the Fair Sex in such Enquiries, were these Memoirs collected I might say too, that by being let into the Circumstances of a Story, before they come to sit down to the Play, the Attention of an Audience is eased and pleasingly disengaged, and they have Leisure to dwell upon the Beauties of the Poet, the Force of his Language, and the Working up of his Passions

Usually these lives sought to capitalize upon some successful venture on the boards,<sup>3</sup> sometimes, however, they were issued simultaneously with the plays,<sup>4</sup> and in one case at least, mere rumor of a new tragedy was sufficient to set an Oxford hack-writer to work.<sup>5</sup> Certain of these ephemeral biographies were printed as

<sup>3</sup> "The Life and Character of Marcus Portius Cato Uticensis Design'd for the Readers of Cato, a Tragedy" 1713 This, of course, refers to Addison's *Cato*, without knowledge of the play and the connection between Addison and Steele, the following satiric pseudo-biography could not be understood "The Life of Cato the Censor Humbly Dedicated to R S——le, Esq", 1714

"The Life of Coriolanus, The Roman General" 1749 James Thomson's *Coriolanus* was produced in 1749

"Female Revenge or, the British Amazon Exemplified in the Life of Boadicia Calculated to instruct the Readers of this celebrated Tragedy, in the true History of one of the most memorable Transactions recorded in the British Annals" 1753 The tragedy was written by Richard Glover

"Memoirs of the Life of Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex Being a full Explanation of all the Passages in the New Tragedy of The Earl of Essex [by Henry Jones]" 1753

<sup>4</sup> "The Life of Themistocles, Extracted from Plutarch, Nepos, &c with Some Observations on that Tragedy" 1729 Probably by Charles Wilson This appeared together with the tragedy by Samuel Madden, R King printed both play and life

"Olver Cromwell an historical play By Mr George Smith Green To which is Prefix'd an Extract or Journal of the Rise and Progress of Oliver Cromwell" 1752

<sup>5</sup> "The History of Marcus Attilius Regulus, Collected from Polybius, Appian, Aurelius Victor, Valerius Maximus, Aulus Gellius, and other Ancient Authors," 1744, begins "As it is strongly reported, that we are shortly to see a new Tragedy, built on the Story of this illustrious Roman

I thought I could not do a more acceptable Service either to the

prologues to the plays they illuminated, casting the small white light of fact upon the murky conceptions of the tragic playwright. Thus, George Sewall's *Richard I* (1728) is preceded by a short life of that monarch which opens "To illustrate, in some Measure, the Scenes now submitted to the Publick, it has been thought proper to premise a short Narrative of the Life of that Prince, on whose History it is founded, which I have extracted from Monsieur Rapin." Charles Wilson's *Life of Themistocles* (1729) suggests that "some Account of the Hero, as well as some Observations on the Play, will make the reading of it [Samuel Madden's play] more agreeable and useful." And the anonymous life of Boadicea (1753), issued as comment upon Glover's tragedy, records on the title-page the specific design of showing "wherein Poetical Fiction has deviated from Real Facts."

A single popular play was able to support many parasitical biographies, whose existence depended, as title-pages and incidental remarks abundantly reveal, upon the drama that brought them forth. Nicholas Rowe's success with *Jane Shore* elicited immediately "The Life and Death of Jane Shore . . . Her Penitence, Punishment and Poverty" (1714), the "Memoirs of the Lives of King Edward IV and Jane Shore" (1714), and probably also the undated sixpenny and twopenny pamphlets "The Life, Character and Death of Jane Shore" and "The whole life and character of Jane Shore . . . Which is now acted at both the Queen's theatres, in Drury-Lane and the Hay-Market." Fifteen years later "The History of Jane Shore"<sup>6</sup> is still so intimately connected with the theatre that its dedication "To the Incomparable Representative of Jane Shore, Mrs Oldfield," declares "My Business at present is only to light up Candles for the Tragedy of Jane Shore . . . We cannot heartily commiserate the unfortunate Woman you represent, nor applaud You for giving us so fine a Picture of her; unless we are first acquainted with her true Story, and know from good

Publick, or to the Author, than to draw together the Memoirs of this great Man." The tragedy, by William Havard, appeared in 1744.

Cf also "A Brief Account of the Life and Character of George Castriot, King of Epirus and Albania, Commonly called, Scanderbeg. Inscribed to the Spectators of the Christian Hero," 1735, which refers on page 4 to George Lillo's tragedy "now in Rehearsal at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane."

<sup>6</sup>In vol. III of "A select collection of novels and histories," 6 vol., 1729.

Authority, that She really suffer'd the Hardships which we hear her complain of by you, her Proxy" These brief life-histories subsisting upon the drama were so prevalent that they seem, in one case at least,<sup>7</sup> to have encouraged a parallel attempt to make biography serve as an aid to poetry

Antiquarian, critical, utilitarian, these lives therefore became. To some extent they may have filled a real need, for the neo-classical tragedy conventionally began at the finish, and clues here and there might prove welcome in blocking in the events that led up to the moment of crisis By means of these leaflets the playgoer who took his drama seriously may have been helped to flavor his dinner talk with the correct spices from Polybius, Plutarch, Sallust, and "the best Historians" The miniature biographies cost only sixpence and did little harm. Perhaps, even, they did some good supported a few anonymous authors, gave a few publishers easy occasion for the manufacture of pamphlets, and kept alive, or initiated, the realization that of all forms of literature biography and the drama are the most naturally allied

DONALD A STAUFFER

*Princeton University*

---

### CONTEMPORARY ALLUSIONS IN *THE TATLER*

The extent to which Steele used contemporary personalities and incidents as material for *The Tatler* has never received full recognition That his readers became conscious of his practice after the first few numbers and enjoyed it almost to the end is apparent from two letters written, respectively, by the daughter and sister of Robert Harley

The first, dated April 19, 1709, just after the appearance of the third number, was addressed to Harley's sister by her niece and namesake, Abigail Harley It contains the following passage

I hear there is a new paper comes out three times a week called the Tatler I have seen none yet If they are worth anything will send them

---

<sup>7</sup> "The Life, Character and Death, Of the most illustrious patterns of female virtue, the Lady Jane Gray Collected from the best historians Very proper to be bound up with Mr Young's excellent poem, founded upon this noble history" 1714

you He resolves to put in all the stories of the town, warns the gentlemen and ladies to behave themselves well He has given an earnest that he will perform his promise, for he put in the story of Lord Hinchinbrooke coming Thursday night drunk to the playhouse, in a sad pickle, and there railed against marriage in a strange manner His title was not put in but there were spectators enow to tell everybody who it was<sup>1</sup>

The *Tatler* in question, although issued April 16, begins with a dispatch from Will's Coffee-house dated April 14, the previous Thursday Mr Bickerstaff describes a performance of *The Country Wife* which he had seen that evening at Drury Lane, praising the acting and apologising for the dramatist's view of marriage Then comes the following passage, to which the letter obviously refers.

But as I have set up for a Weekly Historian, I resolve to be a Faithful One, and therefore take this publick Occasion, to admonish a Young Nobleman, who came fluster'd into the Box last Night, and let him know, how much all his Friends were out of Countenance for him The Women sate in Terrour of hearing something that should shock their Modesty, and all the Gentlemen in as much Pain, out of Compassion to the Ladies . Wine made him say Nothing that was Rude, therefore he is forgiv'n, upon Condition he will never hazard his offending more in this Kind If a Fine Lady thinks fit to Giggle at Church, or a Great Beau come in Drunk to a Play, either shall be sure to hear of it in my ensuing Paper For merely as a well-bred Man, I cannot bear these Enormities<sup>2</sup>

Whether Steele was mistaken in saying that the incident happened "last night" (i.e., Wednesday) or Abigail Harley was wrong in putting it "Thursday night" is relatively unimportant, the identification of the guilty beau with Lord Hinchinbroke can hardly be doubted His reputation as a rake is established by the fact that he was taken up as a Mohock in 1712<sup>3</sup> and by Pope's reference to him in the seventh line of "A Farewell to London" Lady Hinchinbroke was soon to be exalted among the toasts of the Hanover Club along with Mrs Steele, and it may have been on her account that Steele omitted the offender's title His established practice would, however, have been enough to keep the name from appearing. That

<sup>1</sup> *The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland*, IV (1897), 522-523

<sup>2</sup> *The Tatler*, No 3 It will be noticed that Steele does not allude to the fact that the great beau railed against marriage Abigail Harley's information gives the report from Will's a unity of theme of which only those who witnessed the incident could be aware

<sup>3</sup> R J Allen, *The Clubs of Augustan London* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1933), p 108



Hinchinbroke was not seriously annoyed by the rebuke is clear from his defense of Steele in the impeachment proceedings of 1714

The other letter, written October 6, 1710, by Harley's sister to her nephew, Edward Harley, contains the isolated remark "It evidently appears to all here that the materials for the last 'Tatler' were collected in Russell Street, being a lively picture of that lady"<sup>4</sup> Since the letter is dated from Brampton, the *Tatler* to which Abigail Harley refers must have been several days old In No 231 (September 30, 1710) Steele had presented his public with an ingeniously modernized story based on Shakespeare's *The Taming of the Shrew* Although the shrewish lady of quality in Russell Street has defied my efforts to identify her the readiness with which her friends in Herefordshire connected her with the story in *The Tatler* shows once more how expectantly Steele's readers watched for allusions to actual persons

ROBERT J ALLEN

Williams College

---

#### GOLDSMITH AND STEELE'S *ENGLISHMAN*

In recent years Oliver Goldsmith's plagiarisms have become an old story Most of his borrowings, however, were from French works or from rather obscure English writings, and it is consequently somewhat surprising to find him using a work so well known as Sir Richard Steele's *Englishman* The borrowing occurs in Letter LXXVIII of the *Citizen of the World*, entitled "The French Ridiculed after their Own Manner",<sup>1</sup> and the source is a letter describing the French, signed Ralph English, in the *Englishman*, No 40, for 5 January 1713/14

In the second paragraph of his paper, where Goldsmith says, "The first national peculiarity a traveller meets upon entering that kingdom, is an odd sort of staring vivacity in every eye, not excepting even the children," he is merely paraphrasing the following sentence from the *Englishman* ". . . the Children seem to be sucking their Grannams, and have an odd staring Vivacity in their Eyes, and a pert Chagrin is the first Humour you dis-

<sup>4</sup> *Portland MSS*, iv (1897), 608

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ed Gibbs (London, 1884-86), III, 292-94

cover”<sup>2</sup> In the sixth paragraph of Goldsmith's essay occurs a longer passage which is borrowed .

Every thing that belongs to them and their nation is great, magnificent beyond expression, quite romantic! every garden is a paradise, every hovel a palace, and every woman an angel They shut their eyes close, throw their mouths wide open, and cry out in a rapture, “*Sacre! what beauty! O Ciel! what taste! Mort de ma vie! what grandeur!*”

Here Goldsmith is closer to his source

THE Natives imagine whatever belongs to their King great to Astonishment, all romantick, every Horse is *un Pegase*, and every Hovel *un Pavillon* They shut their Eyes close, throw their Mouths wide open, and cry out in Rapture, *O che Magnifique! O che terrible Beaute!* (p 188)

In the eighth paragraph Goldsmith again follows the *Englishman* quite closely

Upon their roads, at about every five miles distance, you see an image of the Virgin Mary Instead of the Virgin, you are sometimes presented with a crucifix, at other times with a wooden Saviour, fitted out in complete garniture, with sponge, spear, nails, pincers, hammer, bees-wax, and vinegar bottle

Here is the original passage

ON the High-ways you have a Variety of Crosses set up at about five Miles distance from one another Some have the compleat Garmiture of wooden Saviour, Sponge, Spear, Hammer, Nails, Pincers, and Vinegar-Bottle (p 186)

In the ninth paragraph, finally, Goldsmith has the following sentences

the care of cultivating the ground and pruning the vines falls to the women This is, perhaps, the reason why the fair sex are granted some peculiar privileges in this country, particularly, when they can get horses, of riding without a side saddle

This passage is slightly expanded from the *Englishman*

CULTIVATING the Ground, and pruning the Vines, fall to the Womens share, and generally all Drudgery even in Mechanicks, and therefore in recompence are privileged to ride astride (p 185)

Goldsmith concludes his essay by saying that “you may find this description pert and dull enough”, but, he adds, “it is the manner

<sup>2</sup> *The Englishman Being the Sequel of the Guardian* (London, 1714), p 187.

in which the French usually describe foreigners" He might have added that it is also the way in which one earlier Englishman had described the French

ARTHUR FRIEDMAN

*The University of Chicago*

### THE SOURCE OF MOTHERWELL'S "MELANCHOLYE"

Professor Havens has pointed out the similarity of William Motherwell's delicate "Melancholye" (1832) to Milton's "Il Penseroso"—a similarity which, he adds, "may be purely accidental."<sup>1</sup> But the relationship is one of brotherhood rather than of direct descent, for Motherwell's poem is an elaboration of the theme outlined in John Fletcher's "Hence, all you vain delights" from *Nice Valor*, which probably was one of the major influences on Milton's poem. Not only does Motherwell use the trimeter measure of Fletcher's first seven lines rather than Milton's octosyllabics, but the opening lines are strikingly similar

Hence, all you vain delights,  
As short as are the nights

(Fletcher)

Adieu! al vaine delights  
Of calm and moonshine nightes

(Motherwell)

Moreover, the characteristic Miltonic features as listed by Professor Havens are absent, and it seems more likely that Fletcher's poem would have suggested the pseudo-archaic spelling to Motherwell than would Milton's extremely well-known and frequently reprinted work

EARL R. WASSERMAN

*The University of Illinois*

### GARCIA GUTIERREZ'S BIRTH-DATE

The birth-date of D. Antonio García Gutiérrez has heretofore been open to question.<sup>1</sup> To settle the point we quote the birth

<sup>1</sup> *The Influence of Milton* (Cambridge, 1922), 476

<sup>2</sup> Of the biographical works consulted, the following are the variants (1) Espasa Calpe gives Oct 5, 1813, (2) Díaz de Escovar and Lasso de la Vega, July 4, 1812, (3) Northup, Romera Navarro, Fitzmaurice Kelly (French Translation, 1921), Pineyro, Ferrer del Río, Fitzmaurice Kelly (A

certificate of the dramatist which is to be found in Book 41 folio number 107, of the first series of the Baptisms of the parish of San Juan Bautista in Chiclana (Cádiz) <sup>2</sup>

Don Manuel Barberá y Saborido, Presbitero, Cura Regente de la Parroquia de San Juan Bautista, Mayor de esta Ciudad CERTIFICO Que en el libro cuarenta y uno, primera serie de Bautismos de esta Parroquia Mayor de San Juan Bautista a folio ciento siete vuelto se encuentra una partida que dice a la letra

[Al margen] Antonio María de los Dolores [Al centro] En la Villa de Chiclana de la Frontera Martes seis de Julio de mil ocho cientos trece Yo Don Joaquin Rincón Cura Teniente de la Iglesia Mayor Parroquial del Sr S Juan Bautista, baptizé en ella a Antonio María de los Dolores que nació el día cinco de este mes hijo legítimo de Antonio García y de Catalina Gutierrez naturales y vecinos de esta Villa donde casaron año de mil ochocientos cuatro, Fué su madrina D<sup>a</sup> María Graca quien adverti el parentesco espiritual y obligación y testigos Antonio Pelea y Don Benito Antonio Osorio Fí Joaquin Rincón Rubricado

Concuerda a la letra con el original a que me refiero, y a petición de parte interesada que se obliga a reintegrar con los sellos que señala la Vigente Ley del Timbre expido el presente que firmo y sello en Chiclana a trece de Agosto de mil novecientos treinta

[signed] Manuel Barberá

[Parochial seal]

A K SHIELDS

New York City

## A SELF-ESTIMATE BY BAUDELAIRE

Accompanying two of Baudelaire's poems (*Châtiment de l'orgueil* and *Le vin des honnêtes gens*), when they appeared in *Le magasin des familles* for June, 1850, was the following note

*new history of Spanish Literature*, 1926), and the editor of *Obras escogidas de Antonio García Gutiérrez* (Madrid, 1881), gave 1812, (4) Fitzmaurice Kelly in *Spanish Literature, A Primer*, even goes to 1811, (5) Mérimée-Morley, Hurtado y Palencia, Méndez Bejarano, Hubbard, Fitzmaurice Kelly (1921), Salcedo Ruiz, Cejador y Frauca, and Rogerio Sánchez correctly state 1813 as the year of his birth; (6) Ochoa (Paris, 1844) more exactly places it in July of that year, while (7) Blanco García and Rosell (in *Biblioteca de autores dramaticos contemporáneos*, 1881) state day, month and year correctly as July 5, 1813

<sup>2</sup> The birthplace of the author at number 29, Calle Rafael Viesca, is marked by a tablet which gives the date of his birth, etc

Ces deux morceaux inédits sont tirés d'un livre intitulé *LES LIMBES*, qui paraîtra très prochainement, et qui est destiné à représenter les agitations et les mélancolies de la jeunesse moderne

It seems to have been assumed by all the editors of *Les fleurs du mal* that this note was added by Léo Lespès, the director of the review, and certainly the terms of the note would make this seem plausible. However, the assumption is weakened when we compare it with a similar note which accompanied another group of poems printed in *Le messager de l'assemblée* for April 9, 1851

Ces morceaux sont tirés du livre "Les Limbes," de Charles Baudelaire, qui doit paraître prochainement chez Michel Lévy, rue Vivienne et qui est destiné à retracer l'histoire des agitations spirituelles de la jeunesse moderne

The similarity of these two notes is so great that it is difficult not to believe that they were written by the same person; and that person must surely have been the author himself. If this be true, new interest is attached to the notes, in that they may be regarded as one of the earliest recorded appraisals by Baudelaire of his own work

W. T. BANDY

*The University of Wisconsin*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*Forms of Address in German (1500-1800)* by GEORGE J. METCALF,  
Washington University Studies—New Series Language and  
Literature—No 7, (St. Louis, 1938) Pp ix, 202

The forms of address in German are an interesting and important phase in German grammar, yet, with one or two notable exceptions, they have not been studied effectively.<sup>1</sup> Even the few profitable

<sup>1</sup> In 1787, Georg Gunther (*Über das Sonderbare der deutschen Hoflichkeitssprache im Gebrauche der Fürwörter* [Mannheim]) first attempted to explain the origins of the modern German pronouns of address. The grammarians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Grimm, Schmeller, Heyse, Mensing, Wunderlich, Paul, Curme, Behagel) and other scholars (Denecke, Eckstein) likewise concerned themselves with the question, and more particularly, with the origin of the polite *Sie* plural. A dissertation by Albrecht Keller (*Die Formen der Anrede im Frühneuhochdeutschen* [Strassburg, 1904]) laid the foundation for the modern period. Werner Grohmann, treating the forms of address as a stylistic device (*Die pro*

studies are not exhaustive enough. What is needed are minute investigations of the forms of address as used by the individual authors. Andreas Gryphius, for instance, is worth especial attention.

The historical development of the German forms of address stretches from the tenth century to the nineteenth, there has been no appreciable development since the eighteenth century. Ehrismann has given us a definitive treatment of the forms of address for the Middle Ages.<sup>2</sup> He showed that by the sixteenth-century abstractions (particularly *Majestat*, *Gnade*, *Liebde*) were used in the highest society, while elsewhere *Ihr* was employed for polite address. Metcalf begins where Ehrismann left off. His investigations show that for the sixteenth century *Ihr* lost value as a polite form of address, it gave way to abstractions, and gradually, to a new nominal construction with *Heir* (*Frau*) (p. 11). The polite form of address during the greater part of the seventeenth century was *Er* and *Sie*-singular, i.e., the pronominal continuation of the nominal usage with *Herr* (*Frau*). The lowest social ranks appropriated the erstwhile polite *Ihr*, which then even crowded out *Du* (p. 64). The eighteenth century saw a crystallization and simplification of the prevailing manifold forms of address. *Du*, *Ihr*, *Er* and *Sie*-singular, third person singular nominal constructions, and abstractions (p. 118). Toward the close of the century, *Sie*-plural, which is attested most infrequently in the two preceding centuries, won supremacy as the polite form of address. *Er*, *Sie*-singular, and *Ihr* were rapidly pushed down the social scale, while the nominal constructions practically disappeared from use, *Du* continued to be used in intimate relationships.

It is not without significance that the bewildering increase and the simplification in the forms of address were related to the changing social conditions of those times (pp. 65, 171 f.). Address forms, therefore, are not merely "an important phase in the evolution of grammar, they are also a reflection of underlying social conditions" (p. 172). And, further, they afforded authors an admirable means of characterization, particularly in the drama.

Metcalf has aimed to give a representative, rather than a complete picture of the development of the forms of address in German since the beginning of the sixteenth century, an exhaustive study, he feels, would not appreciably alter his results (p. 10). However, an exhaustive investigation of the dramatic works of Andreas Gryphius has been profitable, it has revealed usages which are not listed by

*nominalen Anredeformen im Drama des 18. Jahrhunderts* [Leipzig, 1926]), went a step further, while G. G. Kloeke ("Die Anredeformen im Niederländischen und im Deutschen und in den Mundarten an der niederländisch-deutschen Grenze," mit einer Karte, *Teuikonista*, II [1925/26], 81-90) opened a new field of investigation, the forms of address in the dialects.

<sup>2</sup> Gustav Ehrismann, "Duzen und Ihrzen im Mittelalter," *Z f d Wf*, I (1901), 117-49, II (1902), 118-59, IV (1903), 210-48, V (1904), 127-220. This is the first strictly historical study of the forms of address.

Metcalf for the seventeenth century. Some of these are 1) a master accords *Sie*-singular to a servant not his own (*Horribil*, 84 f, [BLVS cxxxviii], cf Metcalf, pp 79, 148 ff), 2) in intimate friendship a young nobleman is accorded now *Ihr*, now *Er*, now *Sie*-plural (*Seugamme* [a translation of G Razzi's *La baba*], 450, 451, 463, 2, 494, 10, [BLVS cxxxviii]), 3) a servant gives a young noblewoman, not his mistress, likewise now *Ihr*, now *Er*, now *Sie*-plural (*Seugamme*, 455, 554, 569) I might remark, in passing, that, to judge from Gryphius, translations into German are apparently quite fruitful for the study of forms of address, (cf also Grohmann's statement on this point, *op cit*, p 30)

On pp 109-14 Metcalf demonstrates in condensed form the "ellipsis" theory out of which the *Sie*-plural form may have arisen.<sup>3</sup> However, I have found some instances of *Sie*-plural (*Seugamme* [Gryphius], 463, 2, 494, 10, 554, 21 ff) which do not result from ellipsis of abstractions, they seem rather to illustrate Grimm's theory<sup>4</sup> that the shift of the polite address from the singular to the plural of the third person was purely a pronominal, and not a nominal shift. It seems that the origin of the *Sie*-plural form needs re-investigation.

I have noted the following inconsistencies, contradictions and errors in Metcalf's chapter on the seventeenth century: 1) "*Du* continued regularly as the address to the Jew" (p 67), but later, on p 80, Metcalf says that *Ihr* is given "to a Jew by a woman of the nobility" 2) "Even Don Diego granted only *Ihr* to his master, the braggart Daraduridatumtarides" (p 76), while on p 95 we read "*Er* and *Sie*-singular had also largely replaced *Ihr* . . . in address from subordinates . . . from the servant [Don Diego] to Captain Daraduridatumtarides" 3) "'Hofmeister' Papinianus at Rome to a captain" (p 79), should read " . . . to two captains" 4) "Papinianus, the Roman 'Hofmeister,' to his father [i e, Hostilius] and to his mother [i e, Eugenia]" (p 97) should read "The son of Papinianus to his father [i e, Papinianus, the 'Hofmeister'] and to his mother [i e, Plautia, Papinianus' wife]" 5) On p 100 replace "Coelestina" by "Camilla" in "Coelestina, in answer to the marshal . . ." 6) On p 103 change " . . . by the ambassador from Russia" to " . . . by Demetrius, ambassador of Georgia" These minor errors hardly alter Metcalf's results.

Metcalf has handled his matter in capable fashion. The bibliographical aspect of this profitable contribution to the study of the forms of address leaves little to be desired, it is concluded with a workable index.

The University of Chicago

WILLIAM A KOZUMPLIK

<sup>3</sup> "The Origins of Modern German Polite *Sie*-plural with Particular Reference to the Works of Christian Weise," *PMLA*, LII (1937), 1204-13

<sup>4</sup> *Deutsche Grammatik* IV (1837), 308

*Die Berliner Abendblätter Heinrich von Kleists, ihre Quellen und ihre Redaktion* Mit 1 Faksimile und 9 Abbildungen auf 7 Tafeln Von HELMUT SEMBDNER [Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft Bd 19 ] Berlin Weidmann, 1939 Pp 418

Reinhold Steig's<sup>1</sup> investigations of the *Berliner Abendblätter* were based on the assumption that Heinrich von Kleist's newspaper, the first evening daily journal published in Berlin, was not the work of an individual, but that of a political coterie, consisting of conservative officers and Prussian nobles, and that Kleist, as editor, was commissioned to present their aims and desires. But in agreement with critics like Rogge, Box and Meyer-Benfey, Sembdner regards the *Abendblätter* as a personal, independent enterprise which the editor planned to carry out in his own manner with the modest means at his disposal. According to Sembdner, Kleist wished to give expression to clashing opinions in so far as they might promote the cause of nationalism, but the plan miscarried because of political conditions in Prussia and lack of understanding on the part of his collaborators. Their limited support is evidenced by the relatively small number of their contributions which total less than one-fifth of the space in the *Abendblätter*.

Sembdner's purpose was to study the personnel and resources at Kleist's disposal, and the use he made of them. Whereas Steig's approach was based on a study of the contents of the *Abendblätter*, under such headings as politics, the theater, art and educational institutions, Sembdner proceeded from an investigation of the origins of contributions. His amazingly successful search for the sources and authorship of anonymous articles, many of which were drawn from widely scattered newspapers and magazines, was a most laborious, meticulous task. In addition, the author examined Kleist's work as editor, contributor, reporter and critic. His judgments on the influence and importance of the *Abendblätter* are based on a careful survey of numerous reprintings of articles by other journals.

The volume contains a bibliography of critical literature, a bibliographical list of contemporary journals germane to the subject, a register of Kleist's writings, a classified enumeration of characteristic features of Kleist's style and diction, an index of all quoted journals, and a register of proper names.

Chapter one is devoted to a general characterization of the *Abendblätter*, their make-up, circulation and reception. The second chapter deals with contributions by collaborators, including Achim von Arnim, Adam Müller, Fouqué, Clemens Brentano, Friedrich Gottlob Wetzel and others. Here the author displays great ingenuity in his efforts to establish that Wetzel was the contributor

<sup>1</sup> *Heinrich von Kleists Berliner Kämpfe* Berlin Spemann, 1901



of a considerable number of writings Chapter three presents a discussion of Kleist's own contributions which constitute by far the most important part of the *Abendblätter* They are classified under such headings as philosophical and esthetic writings, poems, narratives, anecdotes, criticism of drama, art, literature and science, editorials, reporting and translations The variety of signatures employed by Kleist is disclosed as a ruse to imply a wider range of contributors Sembdner differs with Steig in reading less political tendency into Kleist's articles Chapter four and five treat of Kleist's adaptations and their sources Finally, chapters six and seven discuss news items, their provenience and their redaction by Kleist

Sembdner's book gives every evidence of being exhaustive and thorough enough to be regarded as a definitive study of the *Berliner Abendblätter* The difficult task of ascertaining the authorship of writings has been done with marked critical acumen and by careful weighing of the various kinds of evidence Much light is shed on the intensive journalistic activity of Kleist whom Professor Minde-Pouet once termed the last of the German journalists who began as a poet, and the first of the new-type of professional journalists A lucid analysis is given of the liberties which Kleist took in editing materials, and of the excellence as well as the casual nature of some of his journalistic work And finally, Kleist's authorship of numerous shorter writings has now been established

This investigation is a highly specialized piece of research Its value to the non-specialist might have been enhanced considerably by a summary of the many detailed findings The merits of Sembdner's study were recognized by the Grimm Foundation of the University of Berlin which awarded him its coveted prize Part of the findings have recently been published in volume seven of the revised standard edition of *Heinrich von Kleists Werke* (Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut, n. d.) under the editorship of Professor Georg Minde-Pouet

Wesleyan University

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

---

*The Party of Humanity, The Fortnightly Review and Its Contributors, 1865-1874* By EDWIN MALLARD EVERETT Chapel Hill The University of North Carolina Press Pp vii + 370 \$3.50.

*The North Briton, A Study in Political Propaganda.* By GEORGE NOBBE. New York Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 274 \$3.00.

These, like the other excellent studies of individual periodicals which have appeared during the last decade come from Columbia

University and reveal unmistakably the interest in the economic and social backgrounds of Victorian literature which the late Professor Thorndike and Professor Neff have aroused in successive generations of students. The *Fortnightly* is an important subject for such a study. Few English periodicals have had more distinguished careers. Few have had more distinctive personalities, and it may be said at once, to Mr. Everett's credit, that the personality of the early *Fortnightly* comes to life in this book.

When John Morley, the greatest of its editors, retired from the *Fortnightly's* chair in 1882, he wrote of John Stuart Mill, "He took the warmest interest in the *Review* . . . because he wished to encourage what was then . . . the only attempt to conduct a periodical on the principle of free discussion and personal responsibility." The words quoted bring out the significant aspects of the *Fortnightly* developed in Mr. Everett's study—Mill's profound influence upon it, its persistent liberalism and aim of impartiality, and its novel and courageous adoption of the signed article. As for the first, Mr. Everett finds all the characteristic work of the *Fortnightly*—its humanitarianism, obsession with science, distrust of theological dogma, and insistence on human liberties—springs more or less immediately from Mill, through his friendship with the *Fortnightly* contributors and his shaping influence over the "party of humanity." In the second place, the *Review*, set up as a forum of free discussion, soon became the medium of the rationalist liberalism of Mill, Lewes, Morley, Huxley, Swinburne, and Frederic Harrison. All these and many other contributors—utilitarians, positivists, and evolutionists—were at one in their faith in humanitarian principles and in human progress toward better things. Finally, the *Fortnightly* is very important as the first English literary periodical to oppose consistently and successfully the then almost universal practice of anonymous criticism. Today, when critical secrecy is confined chiefly to the *Times Literary Supplement*, this seems a matter of little moment, but in 1865 an attack on anonymity seemed like an attack on the very basis of criticism itself. The "curtain of periodical criticism" had not been raised before, except briefly and ineffectively by Richard Cumberland in 1809. The weighty prestige of the *Quarterly*, *Blackwoods*, and similar organs, was supposedly built upon the principle of anonymity. To the *Fortnightly* goes the credit for the chief innovation in modern critical journalism. The "senseless notion of signed articles," as an Edinburgh publisher called it, has become the first requisite of responsible criticism.

Many readers will find a weakness of this book to be the small proportion of space allotted to the literary aspects of the *Fortnightly*. These cannot be dismissed, one must feel, in a single short chapter, less than one sixth of the whole. In a study of a periodical edited by Lewes and Morley, and with Trollope, Rossetti, Swin-

burne, Morris, Meredith, and Pater among its contributors, a more generous discussion of belletristic content might have been reasonably expected. The author has, within the limits of his purpose and intention perhaps, produced an interesting book, but his brief summary of the *Fortnightly's* direct relations with Victorian poetry and criticism is obviously meager and inadequate.

Mr. Nobbe's book is more than its descriptive title implies. A study of the *North Briton*, 1762-3, has naturally involved the chief authors of the periodical, both critically and biographically. This, in turn, has led to a consideration of the struggle for English political liberty in the early years of the reign of George III. Just as John Wilkes was at the center of this struggle for the freedom of the individual, so he is the protagonist in the turbulent history of his organ, the *North Briton*. Today, it is easier to dismiss Wilkes as a rabble-rouser and demagogue than to appreciate the importance of his political principle—that the Ministers must be responsible for the content of the royal speeches. If it had been established and maintained that a speech from the throne was the personal declaration of an irresponsible sovereign, enforcing his own interpretation of libel by general warrants, the history of English freedom would be a sadder story than it actually is. That the story is a less unhappy one is due in no small measure to John Wilkes and the *North Briton*, and Mr. Nobbe tells of their part in the battle with fulness of detail and some new documentation. Although Charles Churchill, as co-author of the first forty-four numbers of the periodical, is given a chapter, and various others are referred to—Robert Lloyd, who wrote verses for the *North Briton*, Smollett, the editor of the rival *Briton*, and Arthur Murphy, conductor of the *Auditor*—Wilkes is in every sense the hero of Mr. Nobbe's narrative. That this extraordinary man deserves such distinction is indicated in the words of Junius (*Letter to the King*, 1769) who wrote, "The destruction of one man has now, for many years, been the sole object of your government . . ." The importance of Wilkes and the *North Briton* can hardly be further attested.

Mr. Nobbe's book is well written and attractively printed. It belongs to the rapidly increasing number of studies by English scholars which deal not with literature itself so much as with the political, economic, social, or scientific milieu in which literature is created. Although students of the 18th and 19th centuries must be grateful for this, and for all other works of a similar character, not a few of them will feel that the specialists in the fields of politics, economics, or science are likely to have the final word to say.

WALTER GRAHAM

*The University of Illinois*

---

*The First Magazine, a History of The Gentleman's Magazine.* By  
C LENNART CARLSON Providence, R. I. Brown University  
Press, 1938 Pp xiv + 281 \$3 00

This is a study of the *Gentleman's Magazine* from its beginning in 1731 to the year of the death of the founder, Edward Cave, in 1754. The first chapter, which deals with Cave himself, adds information about Cave's ventures and throws a little light on his personality. That the information available is still scanty is clear from the number of uses of "apparently," "it seems likely," and "must have." The detailed story of the early years of the magazine, in chapters two and three, is told with more assurance, four handles well the difficult matter of the parliamentary debates, and clarifies Johnson's part in them, "literary and critical essays" are treated in five, the Miscellanea and scientific items in six, American materials in seven. The heterogeneous nature of the American material leads to the conclusion that English interest in America was not limited to political and economic matters. The verse, as Professor Carlson admits in chapter eight, is second and third-rate, but illustrates the tastes of the age. Cave's own taste in verse was for the commonplace rather than for the unusual, and the prize contests he started did little to improve the quality of poetry. A valuable appendix lists the contributors to the poetry section.

In the conclusion Professor Carlson suggests that, despite the limitations which closed the columns of the magazine to social criticism, the *Gentleman's* and its followers improved standards in news writing and reporting, contributed to the liberation of the press, and shaped public interest in politics and science. The literary influences of the magazines were less important, perhaps their chief service being in the patronage they could extend to young authors.

Professor Carlson knows the danger of describing an eighteenth century periodical only in its own terms, without reference to its predecessors and contemporaries. His study of the sources leads him to the conclusion that the *Gentleman's Magazine* owed its inception more to the historical monthlies than to miscellanies like the *Gentleman's Journal*. Among other forerunners should be included the *Collection* of 1692, edited by John Houghton, who culled from the periodicals of his time all he found "useful for posterity." Closer to Cave's own day, the *Mercurius Politicus* of 1720 was giving a survey of the weekly press, as well as a "catalogue of books printed within each month." But on the whole, Professor Carlson's treatment, both of sources and of influence, has been conservative.

In some other aspects the book is disappointing. The title-page promises "an account of Dr Johnson's editorial activity," which the reader has to put together largely for himself from scattered

statements such as "from 1738 to 1745 Johnson seems to have had editorial supervision of the magazine" (p 21) Johnson's usefulness to Cave is strongly asserted (p 18) but never satisfactorily established Shortly after saying that Johnson apparently furnished no independent articles after 1749, Professor Carlson states that he "eventually stopped writing parliamentary debates for Cave" (p 23), surely a misleading "eventually" when we know that Johnson's connection with these debates ceased in 1743 The claim of Johnsonian authorship for hitherto unattributed essays rests on stylistic evidence, a form of evidence which is applied much more vigorously on p 22 than on p 132 The statement in the preface that recently discovered materials show that "Cave's success as a publisher was largely due to his Post Office appointment" is not borne out in the treatments of this matter, pp. 8, 9, 10, and 60

A few lapses must be reported On p 10, line 12, "1775" is clearly an impossible date, should it be 1725? Did Cave begin publishing the magazine before setting up his press at St John's Gate? "Some time late in 1731" is the date suggested for the establishment of the press (p 12), and the first issue of the magazine was in February, 1731 (p 13) *The Present State of the Republic of Letters*, which is described as surviving "into the eighteenth century—to 1777" (p 36), began in 1728 and ceased as a separate publication in 1736 Perhaps Professor Carlson has been confused by a similarity of title, for the *Present State* was absorbed by the *History of the Works of the Learned*, a book-journal which ran from 1737 to 1743, and which has the same title as another book-journal which ran from 1699 to 1712. The *Monthly Chronicle* of 1728 is credited with originating the scheme of giving particular attention to books published by its proprietors (p 45), John Dunton had discovered this by 1692 Dunton's *Athenian Mercury* is cited as an example of a "weekly journal" into which "essay material was introduced at an early date as an adjunct to the news" (p 47), a most inaccurate description of Dunton's question-and-answer periodical. The *Tatler* and the *Spectator* are referred to as "weeklies" (p. 35). A footnote on p 228, referring to C. D. Yost's work on "The Poetry of the Gentleman's Magazine," is substantially identical, as far as it goes, with a footnote on p 197 Another footnote (p 62) reads, "This data is derived . . ."

Tulane University

ROGER P MCCUTCHEON

*Edward Moxon, Publisher of Poets* By HAROLD G. MERRIAM  
New York Columbia University Press, 1939 Pp. vii + 223  
\$2 75

*Edmund Burke and His Kinsmen A Study of the Statesman's  
Financial Integrity and Private Relationships* By DIXON  
WECTER (University of Colorado Studies Series B, Studies  
in the Humanities, Vol I, No I) Boulder, Colorado 1939  
Pp 113 \$1 00

Edward Moxon became a publisher in 1830. He was then twenty-nine, with a dozen years of experience in the book trade. As a very minor poet he had come to Lamb's kindly notice, and by native sensibility and intelligence had commended himself to almost the whole circle of Lamb's wide acquaintance. Rogers, the banker-poet, gave financial backing, and Elia, until his death, gave advice. Their confidence in the young publisher was richly justified. In 1850, when Wordsworth's successor as laureate was chosen, "the six poets who were considered for the post—Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Samuel Rogers, Leigh Hunt, Henry Taylor, Sheridan Knowles, and Alfred Tennyson—had each published for a period of years with Edward Moxon." He had also brought out the later collections of Wordsworth, the Browning poems of the forties, and important editions of Coleridge, Keats, and Shelley. And though primarily a publisher of poets, Moxon was business man enough to prosper, generous enough to earn the confidence of his clients.

Professor Merriam, however, makes no extravagant claims for Moxon. He has preferred to sift carefully the large mass of relevant material, notably some unpublished letters between Moxon and Wordsworth. If the resulting volume has something of the flavor and appearance of a compilation, it is partly because the author has been scrupulously objective in his treatment and arrangement of facts, and partly because Moxon, in spite of spectacular success, was a most unspectacular man. His liking for Shelley and his encouragement of Browning might suggest literary radicalism, but Wordsworth and Tennyson were his real favorites. He knew the right people too well, and valued their opinions too highly to be quixotic in his enthusiasms. Yet there was a quiet independence, too, that gave an admirable dignity to his career and to his dealings with nearly all his authors. Professor Merriam's volume will be frequently consulted by all students of Moxon's period, for the career is sketched against a well-documented analysis of literary trends and publishing conditions. It is regrettable, however, that a complete list of Moxon's publications, year by year—similar to that in Straus's life of Dodsley—is nowhere given.

In his monograph on "the Burkes" Professor Wecter presents

the statesman's brother Richard as "a coarsely jovial and contentious individual, who left shady speculations in West Indian land, charges of speculation of Crown funds, and unpaid gaming debts in his wake"; and the quasi-kinsman William as "a sharp and self-assertive adventurer who helped ruin his generous friend Lord Verney and trailed a reputation for chicanery from England to India" These characterisations are by no means new, though access to unpublished materials at Wentworth Woodhouse and at Milton, together with search of the public records, have allowed a much more complete statement of the circumstances than was previously possible The completeness makes for difficult reading, for example, the index lists upwards of a hundred persons unfamiliar and of little importance aside from their incidental association with the Burkes Yet this very fullness will afford the patient reader a useful cross-section of the reckless borrowing, speculation, and patronage characteristic of the age.

Professor Weeter believes that Edmund Burke's early defence of the East India Company and later attack were intensified by the changing interests of his kinsmen—with whom he enjoyed a "common purse" Even so, it is maintained, all their shady dealings cast no real shadow on the character of Edmund In a legal sense, perhaps it does not Yet his vigorous denial of partisan interest in the Company, his ambiguous answer to the suit of his patron Verney, and his apparent protection of Richard from trial for embezzlement hardly increase Burke's reputation Either he was something less than honest, or surprisingly muddled when kinsmen and money were concerned

B R McELDERRY, JR

*The State College of Washington*

---

*Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century* Edited by CARLETON BROWN. Oxford at the Clarendon Press [New York Oxford University Press], 1939. Pp xxxii + 396 \$3 50.

Professor Brown has produced, as expected, a book of fifteenth-century religious verse entirely worthy to stand beside its two distinguished predecessors, his classic collections of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century lyrics His unsurpassed knowledge of the original sources has enabled him to select from no less than 119 different manuscripts the texts of the 192 poems which he offers Seventy-four of the lyrics are here printed for the first time, a few more are brought for the first time into general notice, and the texts of still others are improved by Professor Brown's use of better manuscripts and better methods. He has wisely grouped his texts according to their subject matter instead of by their manuscripts or

their uncertain chronological order, and thereby well serves the reader's pleasure and convenience. Otherwise the book follows the general pattern of its two forerunners, with an introduction (which every reader will wish longer), notes, a serviceable glossary, and an index of first lines

Because of their accessibility elsewhere the editor has excluded works by the best known poets of the period, except for two prayers by Lydgate never before presented entire, Bishop Pecock's lines on faith and reason, and Skelton's "Lament of the Soul of Edward IV." But the collective talent of the nameless or fameless makers of the remaining poems needs no apology, and it can no longer be respectable for the historian of poetry to slide in haste over the fifteenth century. Of the previously unpublished pieces one of the most striking is "Brother, Abide" (No 109), a long but not tiresome complaint of Christ to sinful man in which the review of the Saviour's life is marked by some fine realistic touches such as

Then sodenly the folke feelle in roure,  
And wyth one voyce they cryed, 'hang vp this theff'.

No 127, "Vpon my Ryght syde y me leye," is a haunting evening prayer with a breath of the folk-charm in it, and No 151, the "Vanitas Vanitatum" signed "Rate," has an especially good concluding stanza. The excellence of most of the very short lyrics is noteworthy. A poem, no less than a play, some ten words long can be tedious, and fifteenth-century manuscripts offer many wearisome brevities. They are not here. Instead we find, for example, No 164, "Death, the Port of Peace," a single stanza that excels much of the similar verse of the Elizabethan song books, and No 111, "Christ Triumphant," an epigram of thrilling simplicity that would adorn a seventeenth-century miscellany. Professor Brown makes a strong point in closing his introduction with an assertion of the continuity of lyric tradition from Middle Ages to Renaissance.

Amid a wealth of editorial as well as poetical merits there are a few disappointments. A reader whose interest is caught by the statement (p. xix) that "In the lyrical development of the century perhaps the most characteristic feature was the rise of the carol" will be surprised to see that the number or identity of the pieces to be assigned to the type is nowhere positively stated. The word "carol" is applied by the editor himself to no specific lyric or group of lyrics in the collection in titles, section headings, and notes the apparent taboo is unbroken. The presence of a musical accompaniment to Nos. 2 and 139 is noted, but no mention is made of the music written with Nos. 72, 75, 76, 77B, and 80.

One typographical feature is less than satisfactory, the treatment of lines of prose or verse prefixed to a text. The same type face (smaller than that of the stanzas) is employed whether the prefixed words are a burden (e.g. Nos. 3, 72, 75, 87, 106, 121, 123), a



title or description found in the manuscript (e g. Nos 11, 22, 30, 66, 102, 138), preliminary notes (Nos 27, 34, 103), or a part or the whole of the original from which the piece is translated or adapted (e g. Nos 19, 90, 119, 162). Even this procedure is not uniform in No 16 a burden and in Nos 61, 132 the titles are italicized, and in No 151 the title is in the same type as the stanza-text. In No. 118 the heading "a carolle" and the burden are in the same type and unspaced, although the manuscript joins the two lines of the burden by a bracket. No 81 is most puzzling, for it appears as if Professor Brown has found a burden for "I sing of a maiden" which has been overlooked by its previous editors.

No 102, "Thou Sinful Man that by Me Goes," is a highly interesting piece, as it gives a better version of a poem imperfectly known in other texts, but the notes on it are badly confused. They allege that a text from B. M. Addit. MS. 37049, f. 27<sup>vo</sup> (read "67<sup>vo</sup>", see the editor's *Register of Middle English Religious Verse*, No 752) was printed by Dyce in his *Works of Skelton*. But what Dyce printed was "Vexilla Regis Prodeunt," a late version of the poem put into carol form. He took it from Bliss's partial reprint of Richard Kele's *Christmas carolles*, and it is to this text that F. Brie's discussion in *Englische Studien* applies. Professor Brown does not mention Kele's version, which contains three stanzas of No 102 not found in the Edinburgh manuscript and is occasionally closer in its readings. One of these stanzas is that on the number of Christ's wounds (with an extra hundred in No 102 and a very odd number in Kele), which should have at least a cross-reference to the notes on No 92.

Typographical errors are very few and their corrections mostly obvious, but in the notes on No 166, reference to Ritson, for "p 11" read "p 111," and in those on No 84, lest this reviewer be credited with a non-existent work, for "*Old Eng. Carols*" read "*Early Eng. Carols*."

RICHARD L. GREENE

*The University of Rochester*

---

*Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of Ben Jonson.* By CHARLES FRANCIS WHEELER. Princeton: Princeton University Press, for the University of Cincinnati, 1938. Pp viii + 216 \$3 50.

In this book Dr. Wheeler sets before us with scholarly thoroughness the sources of Ben Jonson's allusions to classical mythology. In the Introduction he applies a discriminating literary taste to the discussion of Jonson's use of the myths. Aside from its interest, the book should prove to be a handy reference work, for while the

Index is intended chiefly as a guide to the introductory pages, the text itself falls into alphabetical order under the names of the deities and other mythological subjects with which the author is concerned. In all but a few cases, Dr Wheeler determines the specific source of each allusion, or points out a number of possible sources with which learned Ben was familiar. As for the exceptions referred to, the present reviewer can perhaps throw some light on one or two of them.

Jonson himself states that his description of Fame, Harmony, and Truth is based on Cesare Ripa's *Iconologia*, a work Dr Wheeler was unable to consult.<sup>1</sup> In the only edition of the book accessible to the reviewer—that of 1645<sup>2</sup>—Ripa describes Good Fame<sup>3</sup> and Harmony<sup>4</sup> as Jonson does, save that he makes no mention of Fame's head and feet, and suggests rather than anticipates the poet's conception of Harmony's dress.<sup>5</sup> The magnificent Truth of *The Barriers* is hardly to be recognized in any of the five images described by Ripa,<sup>6</sup> yet one of these figures has golden hair and holds a mirror in her hand, while another holds a sun. Still another grasps an hour-glass, by which is signified, explains our author, that the truth always emerges in time. This interpretation accounts, perhaps, for Jonson's calling Truth the daughter of Saturn.<sup>7</sup> It may be added here that the heart suspended from Good Fame's golden necklace is interpreted as follows: "The heart signifies, as Oro Apolline states in his *Hieroglyphs*, the good fame of a worthy man."<sup>8</sup>

A few remarks on Mars, Daedalus, Hesperus, and the Sylvens will bring this review to a close. It is perhaps rash to infer from *Poetaster*, iv, 3, that Jonson conceived of Mars as fond of wine.<sup>9</sup> If he did, he may possibly have been influenced by Boccaccio, who, interpreting Statius's assertion that Mars dwelt among the Bistones and Thracians, accuses these peoples of incontinence in eating and drinking, turbulence, fierceness, and treachery, "all of which," he adds, "appertains to Mars."<sup>10</sup> Turning from *Poetaster* to *Pleasure*

<sup>1</sup> Pp 94, 110, 173

<sup>2</sup> *Iconologia di Cesare Ripa* Perugia, Venice, 1645. This book may be consulted in the Library of Congress. The 1645 edition was preceded by six others, the first of which appeared in 1593. Toffanni, *Il cinquecento* (Milan, 1935), p 591.

<sup>3</sup> Ripa, *op cit*, p 192

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, p 44

<sup>5</sup> "The dress," says Ripa, "is of seven colors, trimmed with gold and various jewels."

<sup>6</sup> *Op cit*, pp 665, 666. Four of the figures are nude, "to signify the simplicity of truth." One is dressed in white. None is crowned. Nothing is said about their faces.

<sup>7</sup> Cf Wheeler, p 173

<sup>8</sup> Cf Wheeler, p 94

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, p 139

<sup>10</sup> Boccaccio, *De genealogus deorum*, ix, 3. "Sunt hi sanguine abundantes obtruncatores ciborum, vini ingurgitatores imoderati, consilio segnes, fraudibus copiosi, in praecipitia faciles, clamorosi, furiosi, nil nisi certamen optantes, et ridentes vulnera quae omnia Marti competunt."

*Reconciled to Virtue*, we may recall that Daedalus<sup>11</sup> was indeed accounted a wise man in Jonson's time. Blount, in his *Glossographia*, tells us that he "first invented the Saw, Ax, Sail and Sail-yards for a ship," and that the word *Dedalean* means, among other things, "expert or cunning." In the masque, "wise Daedalus" is perhaps a symbol of alert prudence guiding man through the perplexities of life. Jonson's interpretation of the labyrinth, by the way, is anticipated by Natalis Comes,<sup>12</sup> who also informs us that according to certain authors Hesperus<sup>13</sup> was a man "noted for piety, justice, and humanity."<sup>14</sup> In several of Ben Jonson's works we read of "Sylvans."<sup>15</sup> These, however, are not mythological characters at all. The sylvan, or wild-man, or wodewose, common in masques, was conceived of as a wild, human forest-dweller. Sometimes he grasped a club, sometimes a torch.<sup>16</sup>

C. W. LEMMI

Goucher College

*Une philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de Vauvenargues* Par FERNAND VIAL Paris Droz, 1938 Pp 304

This remodeled "thèse de doctorat" in philosophy seeks to discover in the works of Vauvenargues a quasi-complete philosophical, ethical, and metaphysical system, presumably without raising the issues of personality and biography with which Lanson, Wallas, Saintville, Sainte Beuve and others have been concerned. M. Vial's goal is expressed thus: "Nous verrons l'unité de doctrine qui rassemble toutes les considérations éparses dans cette œuvre. . . Nous les attacherons au courant profond de la pensée de V. qui les explique toutes" (p. 2). M. Vial thus deliberately undertakes to combat V.'s criticism which hitherto found itself obliged by the lack of coherence in V.'s views and by his frequent self-contradictions to explain the works as reflections of the shifting point of view of a somewhat uncertain mind, full of questions, irresolution, and self-doubt—a sort of Amiel. To find the "unity" beneath V.'s thought proves to be, in the opinion of this reviewer, beyond M. Vial's power, and for the simplest possible reason: *elle n'y est pas*. More than once M. Vial finds himself forced to ask "Pourquoi ne se soucie-t-il pas qu'on l'entende?" (p. 39) or its equivalent. Ineluctable inconsistency characterizes V.'s scattered observations concerning the

<sup>11</sup> Wheeler, p. 78<sup>12</sup> *Mythologiae* (Venice, 1581), x, sub *De Theseo*, p. 693<sup>13</sup> Wheeler, p. 116<sup>14</sup> Natalis Comes, *op. cit.*, iv, sub *De Atlante*, p. 220<sup>15</sup> Wheeler, p. 182<sup>16</sup> See R. Withington, *English Pageantry* (Cambridge, 1918), I, 72-75

goodness of nature, action, passion, religion, etc. Though M Vial willingly puts himself to the task of filling in the deficiencies of V and elaborates academically acceptable extensions, modifications, rectifications of V's views, none of the essential problems is altered or solved, and V's intellectual position is as uncertain as before. Many of the details of M Vial's work are partial restatements of work already done — ex., his discussion of V's debts to Pascal, etc.

What seems not to occur to M Vial is that, although each point of view expressed by V can be examined (as M Vial does admirably) and fitted into some sort of general whole (with M Vial, nature or sentiment providing the unifying force), the result is not necessarily a coherent system. Unfortunately, too, this result is without any real significance, either for understanding the world philosophically, understanding V as a human being, or comprehending the genesis or value of a literary work of some importance. Something of the uselessness of M Vial's task appears in his own Conclusion, where, instead of summarizing the findings of his book, M Vial suddenly brings V the man, the personality, into his pages, to give a kind of substance, as it were, to the loosely-related high-order abstractions of the preceding chapters. A peculiar pæan in repetitious *maxime* style ends the work, portions of which I quote in order to show how with the best of intentions M Vial feels obliged to bring in non-intellectual or non-systematic considerations in order to give to his metaphysical-construct V a breath of life:

dans ce siècle de luxure et de laisser aller, V est romain par l'austérité de sa vertu

Dans ce siècle de l'esprit et du bon ton, V prêche la simplicité de la conversation et des mœurs

Dans ce siècle de la raison, V la méprise et fait appel au cœur

Dans ce siècle ami de la paix, V vante les avantages de la guerre .

Dans ce siècle athée ou violemment antireligieux, V juge tous les dogmes avec sérénité, confesse sa foi en un Dieu créateur et bon, et admet la nécessité d'une religion consolatrice

Dans un siècle négligent de l'expression, V fait de l'éloquence le premier des arts

Dans ce siècle égalitaire, V défend les privilèges de la noblesse

Dans ce siècle de salons, de vie sociale V déteste le monde et le vide de ses occupations etc (pp 285-286)

Difficult as it is to decide which remarks are meant as praise and which as blame (certainly the "avantages de la guerre" and the reference to V's admittedly poor production of rhetorical show-pieces are not meant in praise), it is still clear that the clue to the rather confused thought and not-too-subtle personality of V lies not in his conception of nature or of sentiments and passions, but largely in the man's own strong compensatory psychological drives. V himself is aware of this.

J'aimerais la sante, la force, un enjouement naturel, les richesses, l'indépendance et une société douce mais comme tous ces biens sont loin de

moi tous mes désirs se concentrent, et forment une humeur sombre, que j'essaie d'adoucir par toutes sortes de moyens (*Oeuvres*, ed Gilbert, II, 148)

A clearer admission of the motives of V's thought could not be wished. To seek the secret of V's work, all-too-recognizable mixture as it is of wishful thinking *cum* Pascal, La Bruyère and La Rochefoucauld, in a metaphysical theory of nature and passion, when that work stands revealed so simply in V's own words as the desire-dreams of a sick introvert, seems to the reviewer a vain and ungrateful task. It must be stated that M. Vial has done the job as well as the limitations of his reasoned, academic-philosophic method allow.

BRUCE A. MORRISSETTE

Washington University  
St. Louis

*Defoe's First Poem* By MARY ELIZABETH CAMPBELL. Bloomington, Indiana: The Principia Press, 1938. Pp. x + 222.

*A New Discovery of an old Intreague* (1691), one of Defoe's earliest works, is notable chiefly for its vigor and, in consequence, has been neglected and misunderstood. Though aimed at all who, under Charles II and James II, had helped subject the city to the crown, it was occasioned by a petition ostensibly asking Parliament to correct injustices in the city election but really striking at Whig officials. Of the 117 petitioners, a surprising number had eight years before been on the jury lists handpicked for the trials of Russell and Cornish. Miss Campbell reprints the poem as Appendix A and the petition and the jury lists as Appendix B.

Though the poem's debt to other verse satires like *Absalom and Achitophel* and *Hudibras* is obvious, Miss Campbell treats only its political aspects. With persistence she uncovers Defoe's victims in official records and diaries, and, though she duplicates much that is well-known, she burrows deeper than historians into some forgotten but significant events, which she describes from the Whig point of view. Her inaptly phrased conclusion that despite surface fluctuations in Defoe "there still remained quiet pools beneath, deep and unchanged," is just. But I cannot understand her contention (p. 187) that Defoe's devotion to William III has been overlooked. His fury at Tutchin's attack in *The Foreigners* and his annual panegyrics on William's birthday are common-places. Defoe has been accused of many things, but not in our time of disloyalty to William or to the Act of Settlement.

Miss Campbell's enthusiasm is admirable, but her commentary would be clearer and more readable if pruned of irrelevance. An infelicitous page (20) says little more than that the poem was

probably written after parliamentary action on the petition and published just after the trial of the Jacobite conspirators, Preston and Ashton. Seven pages go to show how cogent was Defoe's ironical phrase "the modesty of the Jacobite clergy." In note 2, p 32, I can discover only surprise that Trent should have correctly transcribed the poem's title. The comments on "put on put off" (p 56) and "pious fraud" (p 62) are unnecessarily complicated. A note (p 61) explains, presumably with an eye to the use of the poem in grammar school, that in "He paid for this who first indulged their heat," "first" is used as Bacon uses it in "God Almighty first planted a garden." Miss Campbell recognizes "lives and fortunes" as a stereotyped phrase but traces it (pp. 63-64) indefatigably in Oldmixon, in an address to the crown, and in an anti-Jacobite play of 1690. Then she remarks that Defoe did not use the phrase after all, but varied it, "I think, rather pleasingly, for the ears of his contemporaries." As a matter of fact, in "And with their lives new fortunes they pursue," Defoe could hardly have used "lives and fortunes" if he had wanted to. When he does use the phrase (p 69), Miss Campbell passes it without comment. The relevance of the long paragraph from Locke (p 143, note) and of the quotation (p 153) from Clarendon (since Defoe is speaking figuratively and Clarendon literally) I have been unable to discover.

A. W. SECORD

*University of Illinois*

---

*The Critical Works of John Dennis* Edited by EDWARD NILES  
HOOKER Volume I, 1692-1711 Baltimore The Johns  
Hopkins Press, 1939 Pp xi + 537 \$5 00

In reprinting and editing the critical works of John Dennis, Professor Hooker is meeting what has long been a real need. Except for the essays in the collections by Spingarn and Durham, and selections in other scattered places, the work of Dennis has had to be sought in the original editions, which are rare and high-priced. Consequently Dennis has been out of reach of all but the more fortunately placed students, and he has perhaps been more talked about than read. He has certainly been underrated. He is more truly representative of his age than Gilon, and for his intelligence, fertility of ideas, and critical taste deserves a much higher rank. In making the whole of the critical work of Dennis available to a larger number of scholars, this edition will undoubtedly raise the current estimate of the man, and contribute as well to a more balanced conception of the critical ideas of the period. The first volume now off the press includes, in addition to four hundred pages

of text, more than a hundred pages of commentary. Professor Hooker has endeavoured to relate the critical ideas of Dennis to those of other critics, English and French, of that age, and his commentary provides a corpus of references on critical ideas which is valuable in itself as well as for its application to Dennis. The second volume, which will complete the collection and give us hitherto unpublished material, will also include an essay on Dennis as a critic, drawing on the commentary in both volumes. The first volume before us has been executed on a high level of scholarship, the whole work will fill a serious gap in our libraries.

LOUIS I. BREDVOLD

*The University of Michigan*

*The Gathering of the West* By JOHN GALT Edited with introduction by BRADFORD ALLEN BOOTH Baltimore The Johns Hopkins Press, 1939 Pp x + 109. \$1 50.

*Rebekah Owen and Thomas Hardy* By CARL J. WEBER Waterville, Maine Colby College Monograph No 8, 1939 Pp. 95 \$1 00

*Joseph Conrad* By RAYMOND LAS VERGNAS Paris Henri Didier, 1939 Pp. iv + 234

Mr Booth has made available to present-day readers an amusing sketch by John Galt which has not been reprinted since 1824, *The Gathering of the West, or, We're Come to See the King*. This is a lively account of the humors of some dozen members of the Scotch bourgeoisie who came up to Edinburgh from their respective Main Streets to witness the first visit of George IV to the Scotch capital. In his introduction Mr Booth gives a useful account of Galt's voluminous work in fiction, showing him in historical relation to his Scottish predecessors and to the Kailyard School who followed him.

The most devoted and industrious of assemblers of Hardyana is Professor Weber of Colby College. His latest publication is an intimate account of an American woman who made it the passion of her life to read Hardy and collect illustrative matter about his stories, who had the privilege of friendly acquaintance with the novelist and his first wife, and whose annotated copies of his books were recently donated to Colby College. (Hardy thought so well of her judgment that in later English issues of *The Mayor of Casterbridge* he restored the original form of the dénouement as it had been retained in the American issue.) Hardy's admirers may glean from this record many curious details about his life and intentions and about the

Hardy country, and if they do not care to follow the detailed account of Miss Owen's dealings with the Wessex novels and tales, including the date of each reading of them, they may consult the brief summary of significant points which Mr Weber has furnished on pp 89-93

Raymond Las Vergnas, author of what is perhaps the most learned and critical study of Thackeray (Sorbonne dissertation, 1932), has now made public an excellent study of Conrad's fiction. This work is notable for the many-sidedness of its treatment of Conrad's art, including his style and narrative technique, for the generous use of Conrad's letters and critical pronouncements, and for the French subtlety and grace with which the critic follows through a special line of interpretation. The word "adventure" furnishes the masterkey with which he opens successively the doors to Conrad's personal history, to the objective story of sea and jungle ("l'aventure du monde"), to the romance of character, and to the culminating romance of the spirit ("l'aventure de l'esprit").

Perhaps the most stimulating part of his study is that dealing with Conrad's ethical and metaphysical views. But it is here that I occasionally find myself most critical of his reasoning. To Bancroft's parallel of Conrad's ethical position with Kant's in his categorical imperative, Las Vergnas objects that Kant's position was based in a rational process, whereas Conrad's was romantic and intuitive. It might be contended that, for all the show of logical method, Kant actually reached his categorical imperative by an excursion into the transcendent, that his logic was essentially a rationalization of his intuitive or emotional attitudes. Again, one may question some of Las Vergnas' reasons for setting aside Morf's Freudian interpretation of Conrad's typical themes. Morf regards them as an unconscious reflection of the novelist's bad conscience over his abandonment of Poland. This will obviously not cover the whole ground, nor does it constitute in itself a critical evaluation of Conrad. But it is a curious logic which leads the French critic to imply that, because Conrad was hostile to psychoanalysis, his work may not be subject, even in detail, to analytic interpretation.

These are minute exceptions on secondary points. Las Vergnas' book is the most readable, the most discriminating, and the most intellectually exciting treatment of Conrad with which I am acquainted.

JOSEPH WARREN BEACH

*University of Minnesota*

---



*Melville in the South Seas* By CHARLES ROBERTS ANDERSON New York Columbia University Press, 1939 Pp xii + 522 \$4.50 Published in cooperation with the Modern Language Association of America Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 138

In *Melville in the South Seas*, Professor Anderson treats exhaustively the relationship of Melville's reading and actual experience in the South Pacific to the novels *Typee*, *Omoo*, *Moby-Dick*, and *White-Jacket*. The chief value of the study is twofold, the author's organization, and his discoveries made during the course of long and patient research (see his article in *The Colophon* III 2), particularly in the Naval Records and Library, the Navy Department, Washington, and in the Old Dartmouth Historical and Whaling Museum, New Bedford, Massachusetts. His salvage from these sources, as well as a privately-owned journal kept by one of Melville's shipmates aboard the *United States*, and a copy of *White-Jacket* with manuscript annotations by another, comprise the principal new ms. material. With these should be grouped another journal edited by Professor Anderson in 1937. He has also examined, either at first or second hand, many obscure and hitherto unexhumed notices in books and periodicals published during his subject's lifetime. The parallels adduced to show the effect of Melville's reading on his own work, the personal contacts and influences suggested, all are plausible. As to such debatable matters as the allegory in *Moby-Dick*. Professor Anderson summarizes the theories advanced by his more metaphysically-minded predecessors without concerning himself unduly as to the possible rights and wrongs of their results. Indeed, his most radical departure from their methods lies in his purely inductive technique, in his basing his work on secondary sources rather than on the novels themselves. Anderson concludes that Melville was greatly influenced by his reading and imagination in the composition of *Typee*, *Omoo*, and *Moby-Dick*, and that moral indignation, rather than any passion for accuracy, is responsible for much of the unfavourable comment concerning the Navy in *White-Jacket*, although he finds just as much departure from the truth in the various attempts by Naval apologists to exculpate the service from all possible blame. All in all, this is an excellent piece of scholarly work, based on exhaustive research intelligently and carefully done, and the results are most interestingly presented.

C. E. JONES

*The University of California,  
Los Angeles*

---

*American Writers A Series of Papers Contributed to Blackwood's Magazine (1824-1825)* by JOHN NEAL Edited by FRED LEWIS PATTEE Durham, North Carolina. Duke University Press, 1937 Pp viii + 261 \$3 00

Even the casual student of American letters has run into the name of John Neal, but only to the specialist has he been much more than a name In *American Writers* Professor Pattee has sought to disinter Neal's more significant remarks on the subject of American literature His volume includes, first, an introduction, which is a brief critical and biographical sketch of Neal, second, five papers by Neal—an alphabetical list of American writers with biographical, critical and philosophical comments by Neal on each—which were published in *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1824-5, and third, a review of one volume of the *North American Review* and of five recent American books, which was published in *Blackwood's* in September, 1825 The "Appendix" contains seven extracts on the subject of American literature from Neal's novel, *Randolph*, and a bibliography of Neal's published works

The introduction by Professor Pattee is a useful presentation of available information about Neal through the period of the *Blackwood's* publications Since this essay is the really valuable portion of the volume, the reviewer regrets that it was not enlarged to include more complete evaluations of Neal's works and that the biographical sketch does not cover the whole life of the author The material in the volume contributed by Neal himself holds little of interest except to specialists in the field Neal's genius for misinformation and personal bias precludes its use for reference without the greatest care on the part of the student What interest there is in his writings lies in the revelation of the very positive personality of the author rather than in his perspicacity as a critic, though there are a few evidences of critical insight The volume leaves one with a strong impression of the poverty of American literature in the year of our Lord, 1825

HAMPTON M JARRELL

Winthrop College

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*Richard Alsop, "A Hartford Wit"* By KARL P HARRINGTON. Middletown, Connecticut, 1939 Pp viii + 142 \$1 75 The group of poets known as the Hartford Wits once shone with a combined brilliance which cannot be fully accounted for by measurement of the lustre of its component parts Deprived of all reflected

glory, Richard Alsop now seems to have possessed very little original power. It is not surprising that none of his poetical works had so wide a currency as his prose adaptation of Captain Jewitt's journal. Yet Alsop's position in the history of American letters deserves to be accurately outlined. In order to set the poet's life in its true perspective, Mr. Harrington has had to clear the ground of major errors made by literary historians from Duyckinck to Harrington. Thus Alsop was called a Yale student by one writer, a Harvard student by another, and a "millionaire poet" by several genial commentators. It is too bad, but we must now believe, on Mr. Harrington's showing, that Alsop enjoyed none of these blessings. So with other matters. Mr. Harrington has been the first scholar to examine the original evidence. Nor is a fully detailed chronology available even now, despite the utmost diligence on the part of the biographer. Such strictly biographical facts as have been found are presented mainly in the first two chapters, the rest of the book is devoted to an analysis of Alsop's writings. In passing the author throws new light on Jacobinism in Connecticut, the authorship of *The Echo*, and the development of the book trade in New York about 1800. Incidental critical judgments in the book are often more challenging than convincing, and the book as a whole would have profited by more careful assembly. Yet as the first reliable biographer of Richard Alsop, Mr. Harrington has made a useful contribution to our knowledge of a particularly obscure period in the national literature.

ALEXANDER COWIE

Wesleyan University

*Nineteenth Century French Readings*. By ALBERT SCHINZ. Vol. II. Realism (1850-1885), Symbolism (1885-1900). New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1939. Pp. xix + 818. This volume is a welcome addition to the series of well-known anthologies, which begin with the XVIIth century, edited by the distinguished Rousseauiste. It represents his best effort in the pedagogical domain. The literature of the second half of the XIXth century is projected on a historical background and is set forth in relation to ideas prevalent at different periods. Mr. Schinz's meticulous as well as intelligent organization and selection of material gives the student an excellent idea of the evolution of French thought and French literary art. Realizing the wide range of usefulness his book might have, he has spared himself no effort to make the selections as clear as possible by inserting abundant introductions and annotations. His appreciation of the difficulty students may experience in reading the poets is apparent. He took particular pains to add translations, and in one instance to introduce an extremely effective and

atistic French prose interpretation, by M P -F. Giroud, of "l'Après-midi d'un faune" Not only does the student owe a debt of gratitude to Mr Schinz for this enlightening volume, but the scholar as well, for, though he may disagree with some arbitrariness and a method of simplification, he must admit that the editor has presented subjects and authors in the light of the latest and most informative studies and has supplied him with a bibliographical spring-board which he can utilize to great advantage

E M

---

*George, Hofmannsthal, Rilke* Edited by MARTIN SOMMERFELD. (Gateway Poets) New York W. W. Norton & Co. [1938] xxxiv + 81 pp \$.85. One of the most precarious things to select, for the benefit of others, is a number of poems out of the vast field of a poet's life-work Everybody is bound to have his predilections in such a subjective matter which it is almost impossible to meet, for such a selection will always mirror the editor's personal attitude, and this very attitude will lay a different stress on certain sides and poems This makes it inevitable that this or that "famous" poem is "overlooked" or pushed into the background The little book on *George, Hofmannsthal, Rilke*, edited by Professor Martin Sommerfeld, has solved all these and many other problems admirably. Although there certainly are a number of works one would have liked to see included (for instance I think the book should have included at least one of Rilke's *Dumeneser Elegien* and should perhaps even have culminated in it), both the introduction, which is of a really rare precision and matter-of-factness, and the poems themselves give a very thorough and vivid picture of three of modern Germany's greatest poets The most instructive and most inspiring part of the introduction seems to me the one concerning Stefan George In this introduction George's significance and very narrow limitations are delineated. There can be no doubt that he (and also Rilke, but in a different way) has been very much overrated in the past, and it is the task of our generation to work on the new picture especially of George's—i e. to push him back to the place where he really belongs The introduction to Hofmannsthal may seem to be somewhat brief, but as far as his lyrical poetry is concerned, everything has been said. In the case of Rilke I should only question the statement that "the World War interrupted this (his) development." I should be inclined to see this interruption only in the light of Rilke's inner development—or else to link it to the cultural crisis of that time of which the World War, too, was only one outcome No account of this most interesting little book would, however, be complete without an appraisal of the very tasteful way in which the publishers have gotten it up.

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

*Southwestern University, Memphis*

*Are We Movie Made?* By RAYMOND MOLEY New York Macy-Masius, 1938 Pp. viii + 64 \$1.00 Admiring Mortimer Adler's *Art and Prudence* and realizing that that work is "by its nature somewhat inaccessible to the public," Mr Moley has endeavored in this work to prepare a brief précis of those sections of the larger study which survey the several investigations which have been made into the social effects of the motion picture

ALLARDYCE NICOLL

*Yale University*

---

*Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in The Huntington Library* Compiled by DOUGALD MACMILLAN San Marino, California, 1939 Pp. xvi + 442 The Larpent Collection of plays, containing most of the texts gathered at the Lord Chamberlain's office since the passing of the "Licensing Act" of 1737, has now at last been adequately catalogued. Hitherto only a manuscript list was available. Mr Dougald MacMillan has done his work well. Obviously, in the preparation of such a catalogue as this, including over 2500 entries, no very detailed indication of the nature of the manuscripts was possible, but in each instance, if the play reached a publisher, Mr MacMillan has examined the printed version and in general terms has noted agreement or divergence. For the opera libretti such comparison proved impossible to achieve owing to the fact that the Huntington Library possesses an inadequate collection of printed material in this field. Dates of application for licence and of production are indicated and some interesting notes are also given from J. P. Collier's copy of *Biographia Dramatica*, in making these Collier had the Larpent texts before him. The present catalogue will prove of inestimable service to all students of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century stage. The Huntington Library and Mr MacMillan are heartily to be congratulated on the publication of an important reference work. Perhaps in the future an eager student will complete the task by preparing a supplementary volume listing in a similar manner the dramatic texts, from 1824 onwards, which form the continuation of this collection. Those dated before 1850 are housed in the British Museum, those after 1850 are still in the custody of the Lord Chamberlain.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL

*Yale University*

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Boyd, Morrison Comegys — Elizabethan music and musical criticism *Philadelphia* U of Pa Press, 1940 Pp xii + 363

Brunt, Captain Samuel — A voyage to Cacklogallinia. Reproduced from the original edition, 1727, with an introduction by Marjorie Nicolson *New York* Columbia U Press, 1940 Pp xv + 167 \$2.20 (Facsimile Text Society, Publication 48)

Bryant, Donald C — Edmund Burke and his literary friends *St Louis, Missouri* Washington University, 1939 Pp xii + 323 (Washington University Studies—New Series—Lang and Lit, 9)

Jensen, Gerard E — The life and letters of Henry Cuyler Bunner *Durham, North Carolina* Duke U Press, 1939 Pp xiv + 248 \$3.00

McEuen, Kathryn Anderson — Classical influence upon the tribe of Ben *Cedar Rapids, Iowa* Torch Press, 1939 Pp ix + 316

Orians, G Harrison — A short history of American literature *New York* F S Crofts, 1940 Pp vi + 314 \$1.50 [An incisive, comprehensive, well arranged, useful, reasonably priced handbook, in outline form 52 pages before 1800 46 after 1900]

Studies in English — University of Texas publication *Austin* U of Tex Press, 1939 Pp 231 \$1.00

Van Doren, Carl — The American novel, 1789-1939 (Revised and enlarged edition) *New York* Macmillan, 1940 Pp viii + 406 \$2.25

Weekley, Ernest — Jack and Jill, a study in our Christian names *New York* E P Dutton, 1940 Pp xii + 193 \$1.50

## GERMAN

Baumecker, Gottfried — Schiller und die französische Revolution *Berlin* Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1939 45 pp M 2

Baumgart, Hermann — Goethes lyrische Dichtung in ihrer Entwicklung und Bedeutung Hrsg von Gertrud Baumgart Bd 3 *Heidelberg* Winter, 1939 xvi, 160 pp M 7

Behrm-Schwarzbach, Martin. — Novalis (Friedrich von Hardenberg) [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 3] *Stuttgart*. Cotta [1939] 89 pp M 1.50

Bergengruen, Werner — E T A. Hoffmann [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 3] *Stuttgart* Cotta [1939] 92 pp M 1.50

Buck, Rudolf — Rousseau und die deutsche Romantik [Neue deutsche Forschungen, Abt Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft, Bd 1 = Bd 233] *Berlin* Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1939 146 pp M 6.30

Busse, Hermann Eris — Grimmelshausen [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 3] *Stuttgart* Cotta [1939] 87 pp M 1.50

Goethe Viermonatsschrift der Goethe Gesellschaft Neue Folge des Jahrbuchs Unter Mitwirkung von Ernst Bertram, Rudolf Buttman, Anton Kippenberg, Ruprecht Mattha, Karl Alexander von Muller, Julius Petersen, Wilhelm Pinder und Eduard Spranger hrsg von Hans Wahl Des vierten Bandes drittes Heft 1939 *Weimar* Goethe Ges., 1939 Pp 209 320

Harder, Hermann — Das germanische Erbe in der deutschen Dichtung von der Frühzeit bis zur Gegenwart Ein Überblick *Potsdam* Protte [1939] 129 pp M 2.80

Harsdorffer, Georg Philipp — Poetischer Trichter Hrsg von Reginald Marquer [Die Kunst des Wortes Bd 17/18] *Berlin* Rabenpresse [1939] 62 pp M 3

Heath's New German and English Dictionary [and English-German Dictionary], with a phonetic key to pronunciation by Karl Breul Revised and enlarged by J Heron Lepper and Rudolf Kottenhahn *Boston* D C Heath & Co [1936, 1939] xix, 813, 687 pp

Heiseler, Bernt von — Kleist [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 3] *Stuttgart* Cotta [1939] 96 pp M 1.50

Hofmann, Karl — Die Orts- und Flurnamen der ehemaligen pfälzischen Oberamtsstadt Boxberg im Spiegel der Geschichte [Aus Mannheimer Geschichtsblätter, Jg 1939], 3 leaves, 4°

Klein, Karl Kurt — Literaturgeschichte des Deutschtums im Ausland Schrifttum u Geistesleben der deutschen Volksgruppen im Ausland vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart [Vogt u Koch, Gesch d deu Lit 5 Aufl Ergänzungsband] xiv, 474 pp 4° M 17.50

Kottgen, Gerhard — Wilhelm Raabes Ringen um die Aufgabe des Erziehungsromans [Diss München = Germanische Studien H 213] *Berlin* Ebering, 1939 114 pp M 4.80

Lenz, Wilhelm. — Der Ausgang der Dichtung von Walther und Hildegunde [Hermæa, 34] *Halle* Niemeyer, 1939 142 pp M. 3.40

Lorenz, Philipp — Die Flurnamen von Malshenberg Mit einer Karte [Badische Flurnamen Bd 2, H 4]. *Heidelberg* Carl Winter, 1939 28 pp

Matthaei, R. — Die Farbenlehre im Goethe-Nationalmuseum Führer durch die neue Darbietung der Farbenlehre im Museum und

das nachgelassene Gerat in Goethes Wohnhaus *Jena* Gustav Fischer, 1939 xii, 116 pp

McEachran, F.—The Life and Philosophy of Johann Gottfried Herder [Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature] *New York* Oxford Univ Press, 1939 98 pp \$2 75

Merker, Emil.—Stifter [Die Dichter der Deutschen Folge 3] *Stuttgart* Cotta [1939] 93 pp M 150

Müller, Gunther.—Geschichte der deutschen Seele Vom Faustbuch zu Goethes Faust Mit 16 Bildtafeln *Freiburg* Herder, 1939 494 pp 4° M 12

Nadler, Josef.—Literaturgeschichte des deutschen Volkes Dichtung und Schrifttum der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften (4 vollig Neubearb Aufl) Bd 1 Volk (800-1740) *Berlin* Propyläen-Verl [1939] xxi, 709 pp 4° M 25

Nobel, Alphons.—Frau von Stein Goethes Freundin und Feindin *Frankfurt a M* Societäts-Verlag [1939] 243 pp M 540

Peters, Friedrich Ernst.—Formelhaftigkeit, ein Wesenszug des Plattdeutschen (Vortrag) *Wolfshagen-Scharbentz* Westphal [1939] 30 pp M 150

Preissmann, Franz.—Die satirische Publizistik in der Freien Stadt Frankfurt a M (1816-1866) Diss München [Zeitung u Leben Bd 63] *Würzburg* Triltsch, 1939 viii, 89 pp M 270

Puchner, Otto.—Die Ortsnamen im Bezirksamt Dinkelsbühl als Zeugen germanisch-deutscher Besiedlung Diss *München* Straub 1939 59 pp

Reinhardt, Heinrich.—Die Dichtungstheorie der sogenannten poetischen Realisten Diss *Tübingen* *Würzburg* Triltsch, 1939 175 pp M 420

Rieder, Heinz.—Liberalismus als Lebensform in der deutschen Prosaepik des 19 Jahrhunderts [Diss Köln = Germanische Studien H 212] *Berlin* Ebering, 1939 91 pp M 360

Rooth, Erik.—Vrasmunt Ein Beitrag zur mhd Wortgeschichte Beilage Das Mainzer Friedgebot vom Jahre 1300 [Lunder germanistische Forschungen 9] *Lund* C W. K Gleerup [1939] 86 pp 1 plate

Sass, Walter.—Klopstocks vaterländische Oden [Dichtung, Wort u Sprache, H 5 = Diss Hamburg] *Hamburg* Hansischer Goldenverlag, 1939 81 pp M 330

Schmid, Gunther.—Goethe und Mollweide in Halle *Halle* Werkstätten d Stadt Halle [1939] 28 pp, 1 facsimile 4° M 250

Schon, Friedrich.—Geschichte der deutschen Mundartdichtung T 4. Die deutschsprachige Mundartdichtung in Amerika *Leipzig*: P. List, 1939 67 pp M 280

Schulke, Horst.—Goethes Ethos Eine systematische Darstellung der goetheschen Ethik und ein phänomenol Vergleich ihrer wesentlichsten Züge mit der christlichen Ethik der Goethezeit *Schwern* Evang Presseverb Mecklenburg, 1939 213 pp M 5 25

Siegmund-Schultze, Friedrich.—Der junge Holderlin Analytischer Versuch über sein Leben und Dichten bis zum Schluss des ersten Tübinger Jahres Diss [Sprache und Kultur der germanischen und romanischen Völker B, Bd 22] *Breslau* Priebsch, 1939 v, 117 pp M 480

Staiger, Emil.—Die Zeit als Einbildungskraft des Dichters Untersuchungen zu Gedichten von Brentano, Goethe und Keller *Zürich* Niehans [1939] 203 pp M 420

Steinacker, Karl.—Abklang der Aufklärung und Widerhall der Romantik in Braunschweig [Werkstücke aus Museum, Archiv u Bibliothek der Stadt Braunschweig, Bd 10] *Braunschweig* Appelhaus, 1939 127 pp M 4

Stemmann, Edith.—Der epische Aufbau von Grimmelshausens "Simplicissimus" (gesehen von der Gestaltung des Helden) Diss [Dichtung, Wort und Sprache H 6] *Hamburg* Hansischer Goldenverlag 1939 58 pp M 3

Thomas, R Hinton.—The Classical Ideal in German Literature 1755-1805 An Introduction and an Anthology *Cambridge, England* Bowes & Bowes, 1939 xii, 126 pp 5 s

Weisgerber, Joh Leo.—Die volkhafte Kräfte der Muttersprache [Aus Beiträge zum neuen Deutschunterricht Hrsg Alfr Huhnhauser] *Frankfurt a M* Diesterweg, 1939 84 pp M 180

## FRENCH

Aveline, Cl.—Baba Diène et Morceau-de-sucre, ed R J Quinault *Boston* Heath (1940) 160 pp \$0 80

Bremer, K H.—Der franz Nationalismus *Berlin* Dt Rechtsverlag, 1939 137 pp

Brown, J L.—The Methodus ad Facilem Historiarum of Jean Bodin Diss *Washington* Catholic U, 1939 xx + 212 pp

Carré, J-M.—La Vie aventureuse de J-A Rimbaud *Paris* Plon, 1939 ix + 309 pp Fr 20

Cavallucci, G.—Vauvenargues dégagé de la légende *Paris* Margraff, 1939 xxvi + 421 pp

Cruchet, R.—France et Louisiane *Univ, La L S U* U Press, 1939 297 pp (Romance Lang Series, 2)

Denenholz, Joan, and P. Sammartino.—Accent on France *Boston* Heath, 1940. viii + 172 pp \$1 00

Di Castri, L — Due falsi di Voltaire la dedica del Mahomet e l'accettazione papale *Naples* Pironti, 1939 19 pp

Duclos — Considérations sur les mœurs, ed F C Green *Cambridge* U Press [N Y Macmillan], 1939 xiv + 207 pp \$1 50

Eisemann, K E — Das alemannische Lehn- gut in der ostfranz Mundart von Schmierlach (Lapoutroie) in den Vogesen *Erlangen* diss., 1939 xx + 83 pp

Fallen, Joseph — Grammaire provençale *Aix-en-Provence* Fourcne, 1938 488 pp

Freienmuth von Helms — German Criticism of G Flaubert, 1857-1930 *New York* Columbia U Press, 1939 ix + 104 pp \$1 25

Gerace-Di Vasto — Flaubert nella vita e nell'arte *Florence* Ricci, 1939 247 pp

Gide, A — Œuvres complètes, éd L Martin-Chauffier XIII, XIV *Paris* Nouv Rev fr, 1937-8 xii + 492, xi + 414 pp Fr 75 each

Hirsch, Martin — Anselme Mathieu Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik des ältesten Fehlbribe *Halle* Niemeyer, 1939 viii + 189 pp

Kohla, Frieda — Die Formen des Imperfekts in Frankreich nach dem Material des Atlas ling de la France *Berlin* diss, 1938 76 pp

Morawski, J — La légende de Saint Antoine ermite Avec une Vie inconnue de S Antoine en vers fr du XIV<sup>e</sup> s *Posen* Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 1939 208 pp

Montier, E — A l'école de Bossuet *Paris* Téqui, 1938 224 pp Fr 12

Morino, L — La "Nouvelle revue fr" dans l'histoire des lettres *Paris*. Gallimard, 1939 229 pp Fr 20

Smith, W H — Letters to and from Mme du Defand and Julie de Lespinasse *New Haven* Yale U Press, 1938 xxii + 97 pp \$5 00

Striano, G — Les écrivains représentatifs d'hier et d'aujourd'hui Origines au XVII<sup>e</sup> s *Naples* Pironti, 1938 148 pp

Studies in Fr Lang and Mediaeval Lit presented to Professor Mildred K Pope *Manchester, Eng* Manchester U Press, 1939 xiv + 429 pp

Woodward, C M — Words for Horse in French and Provençal *Baltimore* Lang Soc, 1939 (Lang diss, 29)

### ITALIAN

Alfieri, V — La Vita Rivista e commentata da G Dolci *Milano*. Hoepli, 1939 xxiv + 295 pp L 12 50

Angioletti, Giovanni B., Antonini, G. — Narratori italiani d'oggi Con un saggio introduttivo sulla "Nuova prosa narrativa

italiana" di Giacomo Antonini *Firenze* Vallecchi, 1939 430 pp L 15

Antongini, T — D'Annunzio aneddottico *Milano* Mondadori, 1939 xi + 348 pp L 15

Arcari, P — Manzoni l'italiano, il letterato, il cattolico, l'uomo *Milano* Colonnello, 1939 300 pp L 12

Canti popolari siciliani, raccolti e trascritti da V De Simone *Milano* Edizioni latine, 1939 109 pp L 10

Catalano, Michele (ed.) — La Spagna Poemetto cavallaresco del secolo XIV edito e illustrato da M C Vol I *Bologna* Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1939 283 pp con 2 tavv L 40

Cinti, D — Dizionario degli scrittori italiani (Classici, moderni, contemporanei) *Milano* Sonzogno, 1939 253 pp L 6

Citanna, Giuseppe — Saggi su la poesia del Rinascimento La poesia del Poliziano Epica ed ironia nell'Orlando furioso La lirica del Cinquecento. *Milano*: Trevisini, 1939 47 pp L 5

Croce, Benedetto — Appendice all'edizione italiana del "Cunto de li cunti" di Giambattista Basile *Bari* Laterza, 1939 27 pp L 5

— Conversazioni critiche Serie quinta *Bari* Laterza, 1939 401 pp L 30

Dazzi, Manlio — Leopardi e il romanzo *Milano* Bocca, 1939 xii + 262 pp L 15

Fucilla, J G — Forgotten Danteana A Bibliographical Supplement *Chicago* Northwestern University, 1939 52 pp

Goss, Elsa — Saggi letterari *Torino* S E I, 1939 275 pp L 13

Luciani, S A — Leggere Dante Saggi sulla Divina Commedia *Roma* Libreria "Modernissima," 1939 80 pp L 8

Mascia, F S — Poesia e religione nell'arte di Alessandro Manzoni *Napoli* Loffredo, 1939 197 pp L 12

Montanari, F — Francesco De Sanctis *Brescia* Morcelliana, 1939 188 pp L 10

Pellegrini, F — Trattato inedito in prosa di Gerolamo Fracastoro sulla sifilide Con prefazione del Sen L Messedaglia *Verona* Libreria Dante, 1939 xii + 237 pp L 30

Pelloja, Camilla — Commento analitico estetico al carme "Dei Sepolcri" di Ugo Foscolo, con una introduzione critica *Reggio* E Pedrini, 1939 295 pp L 8

Previtera, C — La poesia giocosa e l'umorismo (Dalle origini al Rinascimento) *Milano* F Vallardi, 1939 x + 434 pp L 60 (Storia dei Generi letterari)

Savino, Ezio — Appunti critici e battute polemiche (Il mondo poetico di Giacomo Leopardi) *Lecce*. "La modernissima," 1939 75 pp L 10



Savonarola, G.—Il Trionfo della Croce  
*Milano* Sonzogno, 1939 315 pp L 4

Sotgiu, G.—Introduzione a una storia letteraria del nostro secolo *Roma* Edizioni "Augustea," 1939 63 pp L 6

Ugolini, Francesco A.—La poesia provenzale e l'Italia Scelta di testi con introduzione e note *Modena* Roma tipografica modenese, 1939 lxx + 160 pp L 15 (Ist di filol romanza della R Università di Roma Testi e manuali a cura di G. Bertoni, 8)

Zoppi, G.—Antologia della letteratura italiana ad uso degli stranieri Vol I Scrittori contemporanei *Milano* Mondadori, 1939 580 pp

### SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Brady and Turk—Romantic Sp Readings *New York* Appleton-Century, 1939 xxx + 274 pp

Calderón—El príncipe constante, ed A A A Parker *Cambridge* Cambridge U Press, 1938 viii + 94 pp

Crow, J A—Cuentos hispánicos *New York* Holt, 1939 xvii + 204 + lxxvi pp \$1 35

Cuaderno otorgado a los procuradores en las cortes de Valladolid de 1351, ed Sarah E Coleman *Chicago* U of Chicago Libraries, 1939 xxii + 88 pp (lithotyped)

Darió, Rubén—Poesías y prosas raras, ed J Saavedra Molina *Santiago* U de Chile, 1938 106 pp

Entwistle, Atkinson, and Peers—A Handbook to the Study and Teaching of Spanish *London* Methuen, 1938 x + 344 pp

Felde, A Z—La literatura del Uruguay *Buenos Aires* Universitaria, 1939 143 pp

Figueiredo, F. de — Aristarchos *São Paulo*: 1939 114 pp

González del Valle, Fr—Cronología Herediana (1803-39) *Havana*. Sec de Educación, 1938 331 pp

González del Valle, J Z—La vida literaria en Cuba (1836-40) *Havana*. Dirección de Cultura, 1938 180 pp

González Palencia, A—La España del siglo de oro, ed R J Michels *New York* Oxford, 1939 xxiii + 346 pp \$1 95

Gracián, Baltasar—El Criticón III Ed M Romera-Navarro *Philadelphia* U of Pa Press, 1940 viii + 508 pp \$4 00

Ibarguren, Aita, y Vignale—El paisaje y el alma argentina [anthol] *Buenos Aires* Comisión argentina de Coop intel, 1938 392 pp

Ibarguren, C.—La Sociedades literarias y la revolución en Argentina *México* Espasa-Calpe, 1939

Juárez Rueda, J—Juan Ruiz de Alarcón y su tiempo. *México*: Porrúa, 1939 327 pp

Léon, Ricardo—Casta de Hidalgos, ed J H Nunemaker and E C Kundert *New York* Crofts, 1940 xviii + 156 pp \$1 30

Manfred, M E—Practical Sp for Beginners *New York* Scribner, 1939 xiii + 186 pp \$1 00

Rodríguez-Castellano, J and C B Brown—Sp Review Grammar *New York* Scribner, 1939 xi + 239 pp \$1 60

Sá Carvalho, J R—Brazilian El Dorado, ed C R Enock *Glasgow* Blackie, 1938 166 pp 5 sh

Suñé Benages, J and Suñé Fonbuena, J—Critical Bibliog of eds of the Don Quixote, 1605-1917 *Cambridge* Harvard U Press, 1939 xvii + 72 pp \$3 50

Tarr, F C—Romanticism in Spain and Sp Romanticism *Liverpool* Inst of Hispanic Studies, 1939 35 pp

Wills, Arthur — España y Unamuno *New York* Inst de las Españas, 1938 375 pp

Zellers, G — La Novela Histórica en España, 1828-1850 *New York* Inst de las Esp, 1938 168 pp

### GENERAL

Abstracts of Dissertations, U of Southern Cal, 1939 *Los Angeles* U S C Press, 1939 146 pp

Aeneas Silvius—De liberorum educatione, trans by Brother J S Nelson, with an introd *Washington* Catholic U, 1940 xii + 231 pp

Donghi de Halperin.—Contribución al estudio del Italianismo en la República Argentina *Buenos Aires* Inst de Filología, 1939

Handschin, C H — Modern-Language Teaching *Yonkers* World Bk Co (1940) vi + 458 pp

James, F Cyril.—A Colloquy on Branch Banking, issued by Am Economists Council [1939] 21 pp

Morison, S E—The Ancient Classics in a modern democracy *New York*. Oxford U Press, 1939 27 pp

Narratio de Itinere Navali Peregrinorum Hierosolymam Tendentium et Silviam Capientium, A D 1189, ed C W David *Philadelphia* Am Philosophical Soc, 1939 96 pp

Oldengott, Paula—Philipp II im Drama der romanischen Lit *Münster* diss, 1938 157 pp.

Palmer, H E and H V Redman.—This Language-Learning Business *Yonkers* World Bk Co (1932). 219 pp

Schapiro, Waldemar — Russian-English, Eng.-Russ Pocket Dict *New York* Crofts, 1939 384 pp \$1 50

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LV

MAY, 1940

Number 5

---

## THE RISE AND FALL OF *S'ÉCRIER* IN FRENCH

Damourette and Pichon in their discussion of reflexive verbs, state that the *se* of *s'écrire* represents an indirect object (*Essai de Grammaire de la langue française*, v, Paris, 1936, pp 771-2) They call attention to the fact that this verb in mod Fr is usually followed by a remark in quotations ( *allant s'écrire* ; "*Disparaïssez!*" ) which they evidently consider as the direct object of *s'écrire*, and they add that it would not be impossible to say "je ne sais pas ce qu'il a dit, mais il s'est écrié *quelque chose*" Moreover, going back to OF, they find that the simple *escrier*, before it had become crystallized as an "essentially reflexive" verb, could be found used transitively with either of two types of direct object the object of the person-shouted-at (*Quand il les vit, il les escria* . Joinville 116), the object of the thing-shouted (*Puis escrient l'enseigne paenime CR 1921*) Consequently it seems to them that the *se* added on to this transitive verb must be itself an indirect object And they end with the wish that " . la grammaire normative adoptât la graphie 'Louise s'est écrié,' 'Louise et Charles se sont écrié'"

If their interpretation is correct, *s'écrire* must mean "to shout . . . to oneself, for oneself" This is surely an inappropriate nuance to be attached to a verb of shouting remarks intended for others to hear, when the subject in their first example above shouts his command to disappear, 'e is hardly doing this for his own benefit Of course, if the command "*Disparaïssez!*" represents the direct object of the verb, then there would seem to be no rôle for the *se* to play except that of indirect object, but we must first be sure of the *original* force of the remark in quotations when found with *soi escrier* (oddly enough, Damourette-Pichon give no examples of OF *soi escrier* + remark in quotations). And if we find that, at

the beginning, a *se* was added to *escrier* + direct object (whether that direct object was a noun or a remark in quotations), then it must have been added to give the idea "for oneself" Let us examine more closely the nature of the simple *escrier* in OF

Damourette and Pichon speak of the *two* transitive uses of *escrier*, the second use, however, may itself be divided into two

object of person-shouted-at	<i>escrier l'ennemi</i> <sup>1</sup>
object of thing-shouted	<i>escrier l'enseigne</i>
	<i>escrier</i> "Aie nos, Mahum!"

In the first two we have a noun object, in the third *escrier* is followed by a remark in quotations Damourette-Pichon consider that this last also represents a direct object, and I think they are quite justified there is surely no real difference between *escrier l'enseigne* and *escrier "Munjoie!"*, and between the cry of a single word and that of a clause ("Aie nos, Mahum!") the distance is not great Whenever, then, *escrier* is followed by a remark in quotations, it would be quite possible to accept this remark as direct object

Now it is obvious that if we were to find *se* added on to either of the first two types, there could be no question whatsoever as to the nature of the pronoun the only possible explanation would be that of indirect object But I have never been able to find an instance of this, nor are any such examples to be found in Godefroy However, though there seems to be no *\*soi escrier l'ennemi*, *\*soi escrier l'enseigne*, we do find many examples of the type *soi escrier "Aie nos, Mahum!"* and this evidently was sufficient to confirm Damourette-Pichon in their opinion They have apparently reasoned as follows (and, indeed this seems logical enough at first glance) "*escrier* + remark = transitive verb + direct object, consequently, *soi* + *escrier* + remark must represent the addition of an indirect object" Their mistake lies in their assumption that the *soi* of *soi escrier* + remark was "added on" to *escrier*

<sup>1</sup> The Lat *exclamare* likewise could be found not only in the construction *aliquid exclamare* but also *aliquem exclamare* *voce clara exclamat uxorem tuam* (Pl, *Amph*, 1120—*Th L L*) However, this verb did not have the military connotation so frequent with OF *escrier*, the one found rather often in this connection is *increpito* (cf. *Aeneid* ix, 560, x, 810) The statements made in this article concerning the various uses of (*soi*) *escrier* obtain also in O Prov, cf the gloss of Appel's *Prov Chrestomathie* and Levy, *Prov Suppl-Wt* s.v *escridar*

+ remark, what actually took place, I believe, was that the "remark" was added to *escrier* + direct object *soi*.

For there is still another type, representing a third transitive use of *escrier* which they overlooked. Consider, for example *Mes Renoars a sa voz escriée* "*Baron Francois, gardés n'i aît meslée*" (BA 6846-7). Now here it is obvious that the object of *escrier* is not the remark in quotations, but *sa voz*. In such a case one could hardly say that *sa voz* was "added on" to *escrier* + remark. No, the words *a sa voz escriée* represent a unit, a complete expression in itself, to which the remark in quotations was added as an amplification, but obviously not as direct object. And the same must be true of the reflexive, for *escrier sa voz* is the conceptual basis<sup>2</sup> for *soi escrier*, *soi escrier* means literally *escrier soi-mesme* ("s'époumonner"), "to shout oneself," i. e. one's voice. The *se* is direct object, just as *sa voz* is direct object.

The form *soi escrier*, then, was created (in contradistinction to the simple *escrier*) to lay the stress not on the person-shouted-at, not on the thing-shouted, but on the vocal act itself, directing attention toward the subject as involved in his own shouting. Now, it is true, whenever *soi escrier* is followed by a remark in quotations, *Paen s'escrient a halz cris* "*A' Isembarz .*" (GI 584-5), then it is difficult to concentrate to a great extent, it is impossible to concentrate exclusively, on the shouting alone. But I think we must assume that at the beginning this verb was not followed by a remark in quotations, but was used absolutely, as an expression complete in itself, with the meaning "jeter un cri de toutes ses forces," as, for example, in

<sup>2</sup> But not necessarily the historical basis. As a matter of fact, the phrase *escrier sa voz* is quite rare (this is my only example) and there is no reason to think that the use of such an expression must have preceded the formation of the reflexive. The reverse is probably true: first the reflexive with its general connotation of purposeful, effortful activity, then the more specific *escrier sa voz* designating the particular part of the self affected. To this the verb *se taire* is in many ways comparable: this originally intransitive verb is early found used reflexively, as *judeu l'acusent, el se tais, ad un respondre non denat* (*Passion*, 99-100), in order to represent a deliberate act of silence, rather than a state. But the first example I have seen of *taire sa langue* is in the XIVth century: *Mès fox ne scet sa langue taire*, cf. *Roman de la Rose*, 4750, cited by Damourette-Pichon, p. 765, the latter take this example as proof of the presence of a direct reflexive object in *Jean se tait*, and consequently, the existence of a *escrier sa voz* should prove the same thing for *soi escrier*, if it be needed as proof.

s1 m'escriera1 s1,  
 Que en quatre loees environ le pais  
 Ne remandrat en bois cers ne dains a foir Pel 596-8

Otherwise, if *soi escrier* originally had not been limited to the exclusive function of concentrating attention on the shouting-alone, it would be impossible to explain its creation in the first place. For, if from the beginning it had been followed by a remark in quotations, if the authors who first used it were already planning to designate the nature of the thing-shouted, the simple *escrier* would have amply sufficed. Or, if it had been desired to add a nuance of intensity to the shouting of a remark, this could be done by the addition of a modifying phrase to *escrier*, as *A voz escrie* ". ." (CL 505). The fact that this new form *soi escrier* was created indicates that it corresponded to the desire to emphasize the shouting, at the expense of the thing-shouted.

As a matter of fact, the form *escrier* itself represented an attempt to emphasize intensity, to the originally intransitive etymon of the Romance *\*kritare* family (= Lat *queritare* or germ. *\*kritare*, REW<sup>3</sup>, 6967), was added the prefix *ex* (cf. *clamo-exclamo*, whose heirs are Romance *\*kritare* *\*exkritare*), with the meaning "to cry out". But as this verb tended more and more to be used transitively, directing the attention on the person-shouted-at or the thing-shouted, a new form became necessary for occasions when it was desired to concentrate the attention on the intensity of the vocal act. *Soi escrier* (= "escrier sa voix", "s'époumonner", "jeter un cri de toutes ses forces") met that need, and most probably was used at the beginning *only* to meet that need.

However, by the time we find this verb in the OF texts, it is nearly always followed by a remark in quotations, like the simple *escrier* (and perhaps even more quickly than the simple verb, by analogy), it seems to have undergone the process of having its original emphasis on the intensity of the vocal act weakened and extended to include reference to the thing-shouted.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Vestiges of this original emphasis are to be seen in the fact that, nearly always, the reflexive is accompanied by modifying phrases of intensity—as in the examples above *à efforx*, *à grant alaine* (whereas this is found only infrequently with *escrier* + remark and never with the type *escrier l'enseigne*, *escrier l'ennemi*). Moreover, we occasionally find the form *être* + participle with this verb *Devant Marsins cil en est escriet*: "*En Rencesvals vrai*" CR 900 01, here, *est escriet* contains a reference to

- Puis si s'escriet a sa voiz grand e halte "Barons franceis, as chevaux"   
*OR* 2985 6
- Tuit cil de Rome s'escrient à esforz "Refier, frans om" *CL* 937 8  
 Et Desramez s'escrie à grant alaine, Qui Vivien li rendra Il li doira  
*CV* 1353 5
- A icest colp cil de France s'escrient "Ferez, baron, ne vos targes mie!"   
*OR* 3305 6
- Puis s'escria à sa vois haute et bele "Ge te desfie, Richarz."   
*CL* 1604 5

This remark that is added to an already complete expression (*escrier soi-mesme*)—what is its relation to the reflexive? For of course it cannot be considered as direct object. Now, if we find the remark introduced by *dist*, there is no longer any syntactical problem: the remark in such a case would be the object of the verb of saying, as *Vint en la presse, sur les autres s'escriet E dist al rei* "Ne vos esmaiez mie!" (*OR* 961-3). But such examples (where the shout is split into its emotional—or physiological—and its communicative elements) are quite infrequent; for the most part the remark in quotations is added directly, just as it is to the simple *escrier*. Its function, however, cannot be the same in the two cases. In order to understand the rôle it plays with the reflexive, let us examine the sentences below.

- Li amiralz en apelet sun frere,  
 Co est Canabeus  
 Les escheles Charlun li ad mustrees  
 "Veez l'orgoil de France la loee!" *OR* 3311 15
- Carles en ad e dulong e pesance,  
 Plureit des oilz, tireit sa baibe blanche  
 "Soer, cher'amie, d'hume mort me demandes" *OR* 3711 13
- Marsilies fut esculurez de l'ire,  
 Freint le seel, getet en ad la cire,  
 Guardet al bref, vit la raisun escrite  
 "Carle me mande  
 Que me remembre de la dulong e de l'ire" *OR* 485 9
- Veit la corone qui desus l'autel siet,  
 Li cuens la prent senz point de l'atargier,  
 Vient à l'enfant, si li assiet el chief  
 "Tenez, bels sire, el non del rei del ciel,  
 Qui te doit force d'estre buens justiciers!" *CL* 142-46

the state, the condition of the subject who is involved in shouting, suggesting that the person who shouts is himself affected by his shouting (just as a person who weeps becomes *éploré*)

Veit le li pere, de son enfant fu liez  
 "Sire Guillelmes, granz merciz en aiez  
 Vostre lignages a le mien esalcie"

CL 147 49

A sa feme vint lors tot droit,  
 Li espee trete, toz irez  
 "Par le cuer beu' or i morrez" <sup>4</sup>

Here we have to do with a histrionic trick on the part of the *jongleur* all the situations represented in these examples are either highly emotional, or, at least, reveal a vivid, fast-moving dramatic sequence of events. The *jongleur* narrating the actions leading up to the exclamation enters so thoroughly into the spirit of the scene he is depicting that suddenly, identifying himself with the subject, he bursts out into the remark without the formality of an introductory *dist*, his inflection of voice, indicating his change of rôle, is introduction enough <sup>5</sup>.

Only slightly different are the examples below, where the remark represents a recapitulation, an elaboration of a preceding phrase (viz "he rebuked me sharply 'how dare you '"), here, *dist* would be even more superfluous.

Li amiralz recheimet sa maisnee "Ferez, baron, sur la gent chrestiene!"  
 CR 3391-2

Tant dulcement a regreter le prist "Amis Rollant, de tei ait Deus merci! ..  
 CR 2886-7

De l'amirail li nuncent la bataille "Reis orguillos, nen est fins que t'en  
 alges" CR 2977-8

Quant li chétis le prent à saluer "Cil Damedez" PO 148-9

Moult belement le prist à aresnier "Sire Guillaume" CN 726-7

The imitative element is still present, first the narrator states, "he entered upon a lament (a salutation, an exhortation)" and then immediately the lament etc. is enacted before us (cf. also instances where the story-teller interpolates a "now you will hear . . ." as *Or orroz jà com il lor vet disant* "Amiré, sure, . . ." (PO 145-46),

<sup>4</sup> Cited from Ebeling, *Kr. Jahrb.* 5, 1, 184f. by L. Spitzer, *Stilstudien*, Munich, 1928, 1, 249.

<sup>5</sup> According to Professor Spitzer (*op. cit.*, 247-9) such a procedure is primitive in nature, instead of speaking in such cases of the "omission" of *dire*, it is probably true that the construction in the examples above represented the original procedure, one that still survives whenever the tone of narration becomes heightened. The speaker "hasn't time" to add a *dire* made superfluous by his imitative powers.

and Ruth Crosby, "Oral delivery in the Middle Ages," *Speculum* xi, p 88 seq )

Into this pattern, the expression *soi escrier* + remark in quotations fits with no difficulty first we are told, "he burst into a shout" and then we hear the shout *A halte voz s'escrie "Aiez nos, Mahum' . "* (CR 3641) Thus, the addition of the remark in quotations to the complete expression *escrier soi-mesme* is to be explained as (originally) due to the same tendencies by which it could be added directly to any complete statement as a dramatic, mimetic representation of the significance of the thing-said

However, when the verb of the preceding clause is one that regularly implies speaking (as is true of *soi escrier* and all the other verbs in the group just above), this practice seems to have become stylized. Whereas the type "he went up to his wife . . . 'you are going to die'" is reserved for dramatic situations, the type "he rebuked me 'how dare you . . .'" becomes a stock procedure After *aresmer* etc the direct presentation of the remark seems to have been *de rigueur*<sup>6</sup> And likewise after *soi escrier* the presence of *dist* is rare

Consequently, in spite of the fact that the remark following *soi escrier* has a different function from that of the remark following *escrier*, still, this difference came to be only a technical one The fact, as we have said, that *soi escrier* was used more and more in (some of) the same circumstances as *escrier*, and used to give the same information, must have brought about a weakening of the original emphasis on the vocal act Moreover, since the formal appearance of the construction was the same in both cases (verb + remark — without *dist*), there was no tangible reminder of the difference in function when the remark is added on to the reflexive verb When we compare a *Paren escrient* "*Aie nos, Mahum' . . .*" and *Paren s'escrient a halz cius* "*A' Isembarz . . .*",

<sup>6</sup> What is noteworthy in such cases is not the absence of *dist*—its presence would be entirely superfluous—but the fact that it was a common practice, when a speech was to be reported, to preface it with such general terms as *aresmer*, etc by this means, first the nature, the tenor of the speech is stated, and then the contents are reproduced (by mimicry) Perhaps we have here another instance of the rhetorical *amplificatio* of which Curtius speaks (*ZRP*h, LVIII, 218) and of which the consecutive construction was so illustrative in OF ( *Car si grant honur lui fera Que sur les altres la metra Thom.*, 747 8, cf my article in *Rev des études indo-eur* II).



it is very difficult to tell what difference, if any, was felt between the two constructions.<sup>7</sup>

There are certain facts which suggest that the two were not *exactly* equivalent in OF, it is usually possible to find with the reflexive more emphasis on the vocal act, less emphasis on the person-shouted-at or the thing-shouted. We have already spoken of the frequency with which the reflexive is accompanied by some such phrase as *a halte voz*, it is also true that it is most rare that the person addressed is mentioned even indirectly (Godefroy gives only one example, I have found none). Finally, it is rare that the remark in quotations is a short phrase immediately following the verb (I have never found a *soi escrier* "*Munjoie*") nearly always it is a sentence one or more lines in length, and usually the beginning is postponed until the line following the verb, thus being less easily felt as the "thing-shouted" *Puis s'escria a sa vois haute et bele* "*Ge te desfie, Richarz, tei et ta terre En ton service ne*

<sup>7</sup> Both in its creation and in its degeneration *soi escrier* can be compared to a whole group of reflexive verbs of the type *doter*, *moquer*, *purpenser*. These simple verbs, like *escrier*, were regularly used transitively, taking on an object limiting, determining the extent of the emotion or attitude (*Sarrauzins nes unt mie dutes* OR 1186). Then, in order to express the *absolute* idea of fearing, etc., with source or limits unspecified, the reflexive was formed ("to give oneself up to fear etc."), and was regularly used, in contrast to the transitive, to represent the intransitive idea of "being afraid", "having a derisive attitude", "being in a thoughtful mood". But, again, the tendency by which intransitive verbs or intransitive expressions take a limiting object (cf. Lat. *horreo*, "to bristle, shudder with fear" which becomes *horreo aliquod*, "to fear something") repeated itself with many of these reflexives and we find *soi doter* etc. followed by an object. This time, of course, the object cannot be considered as direct object, because of the presence of the direct object *soi*, and so it must be introduced indirectly by *de* (*de son retour trop me doubt*, cf. Godefroy). But once the reflexive limits itself with an object, even though an object "once removed," its absolute meaning is lost and we have only another expression with *practically* (for surely at least a nuance of intensity has been retained) the same meaning as the original construction transitive + direct object.

And I think the relation between *escrier* + remark and *soi escrier* + remark is in many ways comparable to that between *doter une chose* and *soi doter d'une chose*. In both cases the meaning is *practically* the same, with both verbs the original object—at first rejected by the reflexive—returns by a side door, with *soi doter* it is kept a little distant from the verb by the presence of the *de*, whereas with *s'escrier* the invisible element separating verb and remark is an unexpressed verb of saying.

*vuel ore plus estre* ." (CL 1604-06) With *escrier* + remark, on the other hand, the person addressed is referred to rather frequently *Il lor escrie "Trop avons demoré "* (CV 671), and the remark usually follows the verb immediately and is more apt to be a battle-cry or a short phrase than a speech.

But at some point the two expressions must have been felt as equivalent. When that did take place, one of the two had to go and it was the reflexive that survived.<sup>8</sup> But only through the extension of its secondary rôle was this victory accomplished: thus it was a victory achieved at the cost of a weakening in its original force. And today, in mod. Fr. perhaps even a *\*s'écrier l'enseigne* is possible (if Damourette and Pichon are correct in imagining a *\*il s'est écrié quelque chose*).

Of course this force has not been entirely lost, *s'écrier* is not quite on the level of a *dit-il, fait-il en criant*, occasionally, in mod. Fr., we can find the verb without following remark, as, . *elle gronde, elle s'écrit, elle est terrible* (A. France, *Pierre Nozière* I, 5, p. 47)<sup>9</sup> and *elle s'écrit et s'enfile dans la rue* (H. Pourrat, *Le pavillon des amourettes*, III, 1, p. 98)<sup>9</sup>. And yet, though these examples do represent the absolute use of *son escrier*, still they do not indicate that the original *intensity* of the verb has been re-

<sup>8</sup> As to why the types *escrier l'enseigne*, *l'ennemi* disappeared, the reason perhaps may have been that with these expressions the connotation was primarily the rather specialized one of military procedure: defying the enemy, yelling the battle-cry, so that they could hardly be expected to outlive the *chansons de geste*. Moreover, this transitive use (or, these two transitive uses) represented extensions of the original intransitive, the first extension, *escrier l'enseigne*, represents the addition of an inner object, a procedure that has continued throughout the language, but the second, *escrier l'ennemi*, was peculiarly characteristic of OF: this is an illustration of the procedure so common with verbs of movement-in-a-certain-direction, whereby the point determining the direction, usually the goal, the destination of the movement (with *escrier*, the "target" against which the remarks are addressed) became the direct object, in OF it was possible to say, not only *approcher quelqu'un* but *encliner quelqu'un* (to bow to some one), *entrer, issir la chambre, esloigner la rive*. And such a practice became much restricted in the later language (the type *escrier l'ennemi* has continued however in Italian *sgridare qualcuno*, with the meaning "to scold", cf. also *gronder* with the same meaning, which likewise originally was a verb concerned only with a vocal act: that of making a rumbling noise).

<sup>9</sup> Cited by Damourette and Pichon, *op. cit.*, p. 769.

tained Could one now say, for example, "je vais m'écrier si fort . ." (as did the braggart Bertrand in the *Pèlerinage*)? It may still on occasion mean "jeter un cri," but no longer "jeter un cri de toutes ses forces"<sup>10</sup>

ANNA G HATCHER

*The Johns Hopkins University*

### LE MANQUE D'ARGENT QUI SE FAIT RARE

Dans son roman *Les Hommes de bonne volonté*, Paris, Flammarion, xvi ("Verdun"), p. 238, M Jules Romains insère une lettre d'une patronne de guerre royaliste et "Action française" écrivant à un soldat de la Grande Guerre, dans laquelle je relève le passage

Nous sommes un certain nombre de dames et de jeunes filles d'A F qui avons mis cela [un ouvrage] sur pied, non sans de grandes difficultés, dues en particulier au manque d'argent qui se fait de plus en plus rare

Le romancier a cru nécessaire d'apposer une note à cette dernière expression "Tel est bien le texte de Mlle Anne de Montbieuze. L'expression avait trahi sa pensée, qui est claire," de même qu'il ajoute au mot d'argot de guerre *troufignon*, qu'emploie cette demoiselle, l'explication "Le langage du front poussait alors [en 1916] jusque dans le meilleur monde des infiltrations bien accueillies, mais mal contrôlées" Les déficiences de langue que prête Jules Romains à son personnage soulignent d'une note ironique une opinion partisane mal soutenue par le raisonnement et le goût

<sup>10</sup> The abbreviations used above refer to the following works BA, *La bataille d'Aleschans* in *Guillaume d'Orange, Chansons de geste des XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, ed M W J A Jonckbloet, Vol 1, La Haye, 1854, in this volume are also included CN, *Le charrois de Nymes*, CV, *Le covenant Vivien*, and PO, *La prise d'Orange*, CL, *Le couronnement de Louis*, ed E Langlois, Paris, 1888, in *Société des anciens textes français*, CR, *La chanson de Roland*, ed Joseph Bedier, Paris, 1927, GI, *Gormont et Isembart*, ed Alphonse Bayot, Paris, 1914, in *Classiques fr du moyen âge*, Pel, *Karls d gr Reise nach Jerusalem u Konstantinopel*, ed Koschwitz, 1913, *Passion, La Passion du Christ* in *Chrestomathie de l'ancien français*, ed Karl Bartsch—Leo Wiese, 10th ed, Leipzig, 1910, Thom, *Le roman de Tristan par Thomas*, ed Joseph Bédier, Paris, 1902, in *Société des anciens textes français*

Le syntacticien connaît bien le lapsus logique qu'implique l'expression *le manque d'argent qui se fait de plus en plus rare* au fond c'est le même procédé, usuel dans toutes les langues populaires, de répéter la négation, sans s'astreindre à la loi de la "logique" que deux négations se détruisent. Mlle de Montbieuze insiste sur le *manque d'argent* et *l'argent qui se fait rare*, elle ne veut évidemment pas dire que c'est le manque d'argent qui se fait rare. C'est la force de l'idée négative, *l'état d'âme négatif* (la *Stimmung*, comme a dit Jespersen) qui teinte toute la phrase au fond la négation n'appartient pas à un mot, il y a une *Satznegation*—comme p. ex. la diminution peut apparaître à plusieurs reprises dans la même phrase le Viennois dira d'un petit chien *hundi is zerni gangi* (= der Hund [+diminutif] ist spazieren [+diminutif] gegangen [+diminutif]). Au fond, il n'y a pas là trahison de la pensée par l'expression, mais l'expression (trahit) révèle la pensée, la poussée de négativité dans laquelle celle-ci est enveloppée. On pourrait aussi parler d'une "assimilation syntaxique" on ajoute un élément explétif comme en phonétique (*nec unus* > esp. *ninguno*)<sup>1</sup>

Voici une page excellente de M. Thérive dans ses *Querelles de langage*, 1933, II, 94 sur ce sujet après avoir expliqué, par la psychologie de l'individu qui veut "mettre au négatif ce que l'on nie," des tours comme *Il se retient de ne pas crier* et *Défense de ne rien laver dans l'abreuvoir*,<sup>2</sup> il écrit

Un de nos lecteurs nous cite à ce propos une tournure populaire qu'il a souvent entendue *Vous n'êtes pas sans ignorer que* au sens de *vous ne pouvez ignorer que*

Elle est encore plus absurde, et d'ailleurs indéfendable, car elle provient d'une confusion maladroite avec *vous n'êtes pas sans savoir*. Mais on est frappé par le rôle qu'y joue l'idée d'*ignorer*, sur quoi porte l'accent de la phrase. L'esprit populaire perçoit, en outre, une négation générale (*ne . . . pas*) et n'a cure de l'autre négation *sans* qui la détruit. Tel est l'inconvénient de se servir de formules mortes, ou trop compliquées pour l'usage courant.

Cet inconvénient explique que les tours où deux négations se détruisent ostensiblement sont réservés à l'usage littéraire. *Vous ne pouvez pas ne pas défendre cette cause*. L'ancienne langue qui se contentait de négations atones (*je ne puis que je ne fasse*), mais encore dans leur verdeur, avait moins d'embarras que la langue moderne.

<sup>1</sup> L'opposé, la dissimilation syntaxique, serait *je ne demandais pas mieux qu'il fût mon ami* (*que* = *que que*), Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.* II, p. 226.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Le Bidois, *Syntaxe du fr. mod.*, §§ 17 et 1916 bis.

Ce phénomène est depuis longtemps connu aux grammairiens Polle, *Philologus* L, p 759 a signalé dans Tite-Live *haud impigre* au sens de *impigre* et H Paul, *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, 4<sup>e</sup> éd, p. 120 cite le passage de l'*Emilia Galotti* de Lessing *dass der Prinz dich jungst nicht ohne Missfallen gesehen*, littéralement 'que le prince t'a vu non sans déplaisir,' où la litote devait être 't'a vu sans déplaisir' (cf all assez courant *sich nicht entbloden zu*, litt 'ne pas se déniaiser au point de' > 'se déniaiser,' 'aller jusqu'à,' 'oser') W Havers, *Handbuch der erklärenden Syntax*, p 56 nous apprend que l'illogisme du passage lessingien n'a été découvert que cent ans après l'apparition de la pièce, pourtant "classique" et lue dans toutes les écoles allemandes c'est que, à la faveur d'un grand nom d'auteur faisant autorité, un texte n'est pas sérieusement analysé par le lecteur moyen, qui corrige instinctivement l'illogisme O Jespersen a attesté la même erreur dans des auteurs danois (*Negation in English and other Languages*, 1917, p 76 seq, p ex. *hun er langt fra ikke såkøn som søsteren*, litt 'elle n'est pas loin d'être aussi belle que sa soeur,' où *ne* est explétif. On peut entendre en Amérique *I wouldn't be surprised if he wouldn't come*, où l'idée exprimée doit être . . . *if he would come* M Gillet attire mon attention sur deux cas espagnols le *Diccionario de autoridades* (XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle) s v *mysterio* écrit "Dícese vulgarmente *No es sin falta de mysterio*, y aunque rigurosamente dice lo contrario, es hispanismo tolerado" ('il n'est pas sans manque de mystère' pour 'il n'est pas sans mystère'), et Ramos 1 Duarte, *Diccionario de mejicanismos* (1898) atteste pour Morelos *No dejará usted de ignorarlo* 'vous ne laisserez pas de l'ignorer' pour *lo sabrá usted* 'vous le saurez' J'ai expliqué moi-même de la même façon dans *Revista de filología española*, 1937, p 35, un *ñorar*, attesté par M Gillet dans des textes populaires espagnols (parler de paysans de comédies du XV<sup>e</sup> et XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle), pour 'savoir' (*no ñoro pzca de* . . . 'je ne connais, sais, pas une bribe de'), et je comparais un viennois *gar net ignorieren!* au sens de 'il faut ignorer ces choses-là!', où la négation (*net* = *nicht*) est de trop (*ignorer* est en viennois un mot d'emprunt au fr, mais seulement au sens volitif 'ne pas vouloir s'occuper de, ne pas relever qch') Si le maniement de la litote offre déjà des difficultés à des écrivains comme Tite-Live et Lessing, quelle ne sera la confusion d'un pauvre paysan espagnol? <sup>3</sup> Le cas d'*ignorer* est un

<sup>3</sup> M. Gillet me rappelle les phénomènes de "jerigonza cultivulgar" qu'a

peu à part Ce n'est pas un hasard qu'il se retrouve dans trois langues (fr, esp, allemand dialectal) c'est qu'à la difficulté de manier les négations s'ajoute celle de l'emploi d'un mot recherché, appartenant à la langue académique, n'ayant pas d'assises fortes dans la conscience linguistique du peuple l'opposé populaire de *savoir* est *ne pas savoir* (et en esp celui de *saber no saber*). De même *ignorant* n'est pas l'opposé de *savant*, mais *d'instruit* (Sachs-Villatte s v âne "on est . ignorant par défaut d'instruction," cf pour l'esp le *Diccionario de sinónimos* de Olives v *ignorante* "Su opuesto es instruido") Le *Dizionario dei sinonimi* de Tommaseo confirme pour l'italien ce que j'avance pour le français "Nel non sapere riguardasi la mancanza di una cognizione qualunque sia, nell' *ignorare* riguardansi anco le cagioni, le circostanze, gli effetti di tale mancanza Quando si vuol indicare che il non sapere è difetto o danno o inconveniente, è più proprio ignorare Onde a chi ci domanda La sapete voi la gran novità?—*Non la so*,—rispondiamo E sarebbe affettato *La ignoio* Ma diremo

Vuol parlare di quel che egli *ignora* E questo è biasimo più severo che dire di quel ch' egli *non sa*"<sup>4</sup> On comprend ainsi la politesse du fr *vous n'ignorez pas*, probablement calqué sur le lat *haud ignoras* c'est un blâme (éventuellement possible) écarté avec conviction ('vous n'êtes pas capable d'ignorer') A noter l'acception *volitive* d'*ignorer* 'ne pas vouloir savoir,' 'ne pas relever qch,' seule usuelle dans les langues germaniques (angl *to ignore*, all *ignorieren*) ayant empiunté le mot, et qui manque évidemment à *ne pas savoir* On comprend ainsi qu'*ignorer*, privé d'une place fixe, ait pu devenir çà et là un mot à valeur *positive*.

discutés M Castro dans l'introduction de ses *Glosarios latino-españoles*, p lxx Pour la France, il y a les mêmes phénomènes dans ce que Thérive a appelé si bien le "parler gendarme," le parler semi-docte du peuple illettré

<sup>4</sup> Cf l'ital *far lo gnorri* 'faire celui qui ne sait pas' où la désintégration du mot a fait encore plus de progrès (influence de *farà il nesci*, de noms propre comme *Melchiorre*) Schuchardt, *Rom Etym*, I, p 11, derive ce substantif d'une 1<sup>e</sup> personne du verbe *ignorare* que prononcerait celui 'qui ne sait pas' pour se donner des airs à noter la remarque de Schuchardt "wenn in der Antwort *ignoro* fur *non lo so* gesagt wurde, so mochte man das als Latinismus oder doch als affektiert empfinden," de là le milan *ignora* 'faire semblant de ne pas savoir' Le développement sémantique du catalan *enorar* 'avoir de la nostalgie' (= angl *to long*) s'explique aussi ainsi le mot était détaché de ses amarres étymologiques et flottait au gré des associations psychiques

Mais ce n'est pas seulement à cause de son manque de place dans le système des verbes de la connaissance qu'*ignorer* est dépaycé dans un milieu populaire c'est aussi à cause de son manque de liens étymologiques. Les rapports avec *in-* suffixe privatif et *-gnoro* (*ignarus*, (*g*)*nosco*) ne sont plus sentis dans les langues modernes comme en latin on peut comparer la chute de *in-* dans *insulsus* > esp *soso* (ptg *ensozzo*) à mesure que le rapport avec *sal* fut oblitéré, le préfixe devint négligeable (cf. *insanies* > esp *saña*, le rapport avec *sanus* n'étant plus senti). Le relâchement de liens étymologiques encourage les dérivations sémantiques cf. le sort du fr *compensément*, signifiant aujourd'hui, plutôt que 'concentré' 'longuement développé'.

Le préfixe privatif *in-* et ses parents indo-européens (all *un-* etc.) étant hononyme (et étymologiquement identique) avec le préfixe indiquant 'une infinité,' beaucoup de mots composés avec ce préfixe montrent une 'énantiosémie' (l'expression du savant italien Bellezza, *Rendiconti dell' istituto lomb* L, 739), un 'Gegensinn,' comme on dit en allemand le mot *Untiefe*, désignant une place où l'eau est peu profonde (un banc de sable etc.), est employé par beaucoup d'Allemands, avec le sens qu'a le préfixe dans *Unmenge* 'infinité,' 'masse infinie,'—c'est à dire au sens de 'profondeur énorme' Cf all suisse *un-tappisch* pour *tappisch* 'lourdaut,' avec un *un-* intensificateur, et, au contraire, *bannig*, litt. 'dompté,' devenu 'récalcitrant' par mécompréhension de *un-bannig* 'récalcitrant' (de *Bann* litt 'for-ban'), v Szadowski, "Gegensinn im Schweizerdeutschen" *Zeitschr f deutsche Mundarten* XIX, p 80 et 85.

Je copie ici un petit article satirique sur une "civilisation négative" (*un-*) qui a pu paraître sous son masque linguistique à la date du 11 octobre 1934 dans la *Frankfurter Zeitung* il montre bien le sentiment de l'individu parlant allemand vis-à-vis d'un préfixe privatif devenu irrationnel, parce que les liens étymologiques se sont relâchés par la chute des mots positifs correspondants pourquoi en effet ne dirait-on pas *Gestum* pour 'élan,' s'il n'y a plus rien de négatif correspondant à *Ungestum*? (comme St. George emploie *Gezeifer* au lieu de *Ungezeifer*) Il est très caractéristique que l'auteur emploie à la fin une litote de la façon des *haud ignoro*, *no sin falta de*, *nicht ohne Missfallen* il prévoit le pullulement fautif d'un *un-* irrationnel . . *den Aufsatz nicht unubel finden* est évidemment une forme précieusement compliquée que choisiront

de médiocres penseurs pour *nicht übel*, voire *gut finden* —la litote, forme de la mesure classique d'après Gide, est délicate à manier pour des esprits peu souples

### Der Un.

Der Un ist es, der die Pein in unser Leben bringt Wo sind die Zeiten hin, da Hold und Wirsch ihr Wesen trieben? Der Unhold ist geblieben. Er treibt sein Unwesen. Der Hold aber ist längst verblichen Seht euch um! Wo trifft ihr einen Hold? Nur der Bold ist noch da und dort zu sehen, sein unangenehmer Bruder

Konnt ihr euch denken, dass es Zeiten gegeben hat, wo es stets erhört war, dass jemandem ein Gemach geschah? Ihr werdet nur von unerhörter Unbill sagen hören, Ungemach wird euch zustossen und in gemeinen Unflat werdet ihr geraten Irgendwo aber musste es doch trotz alledem einen flatigen Menschen geben, einen wirschen Kerl, bei dem es einem sehr geheuer ist und bei dem heimlich noch nicht verstohlen heisst, sondern das wahre Gegenteil von unheimlich ist

Wo ist der Mann zu finden, dieses freundliche Getum, dieser beholfene Mensch von geschlachten Manieren? Lasst uns, wenn ihr ihn wisst, ohne Uebereilung und mit Gestum zu ihm gehen Es passt nicht zu ihm, dass wir ihn mit unbandiger Erwartung entgengetreten Bündig, aber unverschamt wollen wir sein Denn Verschamtheit hiesse bei uns, die wir das Junglingsalter verlassen haben, und die wir nicht Unrat zu wittern brauchen, die wir zu einem ratlichen Mensch gehen, der nur freundliches Geziefer um sich hat—Verschamtheit hiesse bei uns Unaufrichtigkeit.

Er soll uns ja über die gefährlichen Untiefen unserer Ratlosigkeit hinwegführen, er soll uns sagen, warum es geschehen konnte, dass es von seinen Tugenden nur noch die Verneinungen gibt, und warum die Deutschen der letzten hundert Jahre von vielen sinnigen Dingen nur noch die unformige Kehrseite kennen, den Unflat, den Unhold, das Ungewitter, den Unrat und das Ungeheuer? Wo ist das Geheuer geblieben, dieses schöne Tier?

Der Un ist ein Uebel, das in unserer Sprache sitzt Die Verantwortlichen sollten es so aufmerksam betrachten wie den Krebs. Werdet nicht von Unwillen erfasst, ihr Akademiker, ihr Unsterblichen, wenn ich euch an eure Pflicht mahne, die deutsche Sprache von der Vergiftung durch die Verneinung zu erretten

Es ist soweit gekommen, dass ich befürchte, einer von euch



mochte diesen Aufsatz nicht unubel finden Dabei konnte man von ihm nur sagen, dass er nicht ubel sei Dies ist seine einzige Rechtfertigung Mit Fug durftet ihr sonst sagen, dass ich nur Unfug treibe Es liegt bei euch, aus Unsinn Sinn zu machen Nichts fur ungut!

LEO SPITZER

### A MONETARY QUESTION IN *GAUTIER D'AUPAIS*?

In *PMLA*, LIV (1939), pp 629-36, Raphael Levy advances an interesting but debatable interpretation of verse 516 of the 13th century *poème courtois*, *Gautier d'Aupais*<sup>1</sup> This verse ("Quar me di ou fus nez, le lour et le retor") forms the essential part of a question put to the protagonist by the heroine to whom he has spoken of his love Dr Levy suggests it be understood "Paile-moi donc de ta naissance, de la rente que tu recevras après ton mariage et du patrimoine dont tu t'attends à hériter" He defends the unromantic nature of this interpretation on the grounds of a strong monetary thread running through the poem, which he points out in a résumé to which I refer the reader

I question, however, whether an impartial study would find the monetary element as omnipresent as Dr Levy's résumé suggests To touch upon it only briefly, at least two of its manifestations noted by him (vv 573, 581) are purely colloquial expressions, akin to an American "It's not worth a cent", while several others (vv 108, 155, 182, 235, 247-256) have either a figurative value or serve to intensify a distinctly non-monetary emotional content

But a more serious doubt may be raised when the suggested interpretation is tested against its context in the poem, and particularly against Gautier's (the protagonist's) answer

Gautier, wandering in poverty about the provinces and eventually hiring himself as watchman in the gûil's house, has ventured to make known his passion The gûil's question in the form in which Dr Levy would have it, impels the assumption that she knows Gautier to be more than he seems—knows him, that is, to be of a position to have marriage portion and inheritance—and implies that she is considering a possible marriage

<sup>1</sup> Edmond Faral, *Gautier d'Aupais* (Paris, 1919) M Faral was unable to interpret the verse and suggested an emendation

But all indications in the poem point to the excellence of the young man's disguise. The servant through whom he first seeks work in the girl's house, suggests he might find a place behind the plough. The jongleur to whom Gautier confides his love, is consternated at its temerity. "Foi que tu dois saint Pere," he exclaims, "Sez tu miex que tu dis? Es tu si fols? La touse est gentil fame." And later on, when the girl speaks to her mother, she will say "He came here not for need (which the mother has evidently supposed to be the case) but for love of me."

The best guide to the girl's question in v. 516 must logically be Gautier's answer to it. Dr. Levy quotes most of it, but I may summarize it briefly. "You have adjured me and I shall speak the truth. I was born at Aupais, son of a vavasseur. My father is a knight feared in many a tournament. May God who makes the flowers bloom save him, for when he dies I shall receive the fief.<sup>2</sup> He beat me and I departed in anger. You have taken me as a fisherman takes a fish. If you fail to comfort me, madness is my fate. *Damoisele*," he concludes, "I have told the truth." And the girl, hearing this, thinks "Indeed, if he were not noble he would never dare so speak to me."

Clearly, if she has asked for precise financial information she has received no answer at all. Yet Gautier appears to be conscious of having answered fully, and in succeeding verses his young mistress's only concern is to verify what has been told her.

To this end she sends a messenger to Aupais, charging him to inquire of Gautier's "*estre et couvenant*," which terms I translate as "condition."<sup>3</sup> The messenger learns not only the truth of what Gautier has said, but that he is to inherit 300 gold marks a year. Yet curiously enough, he does not carry this precious information back to his mistress. That, apparently, is not what he was sent to learn. What he does report is that Gautier is noble and highly respected, that he is the eldest son and will one day hold the fiefs.

<sup>2</sup> "Quar quant il fenra je recevrai l'onor." No one word lends itself to the translation of this *quar* which (taken with the hope expressed for the father's life) implies reluctance to face an advantage which must entail the father's death. *Onor*, too, though signifying "possession," "fief" etc., retains a shadow of the idea "honor" which, originally, such possession represented.

<sup>3</sup> Godefroy translates both terms as '*manière d'être*,' the first also as 'condition' and the second as 'disposition, circumstance.'

The demoiselle tells her mother of Gautier's love which is now fervently returned, but we find her telling no more than what Gautier has told her. In spite of this, the mother's first impulse is to have Gautier put out of the house within the hour, and only very earnest pleading upon her daughter's part shakes this determination.

Consequently we must conclude that the heroine never does learn Gautier's marriage portion and inheritance, and that she wins over her mother without the latter's evincing any curiosity on either score. What is important to everyone involved is the young man's social condition and rank, his place in the complex feudal world. It is this concern which dominates Gautier's answer, the heroine's orders to her messenger, the messenger's report, the heroine's speech with her mother, the mother's revealing the situation to her husband—in short, every psychological hinge of the story which does not veil itself behind such difficulty as does verse 516. It is a concern, furthermore, perfectly in keeping with the motif of a medieval *poème courtois*.

Dr. Levy's paper presents fully the linguistic and semantic problems posed by the word *lour* or *loure* (both forms being attested for this derivative of *lucrum*). But we note that he attributes to *lour*, "argent," the very special sense of "marriage portion" which is established only for its cognate *logre*.

It is my suggestion that these problems may be simplified if we identify the word under discussion with the equally widely attested *loure* or *lourre*, modern "leurre," the "lure."<sup>4</sup> For this purpose a basis of argument may be provided by Jean Molinet. The following lines are from the series of stanzas forming a "Recollection des merveilleuses advenues," and mask a reference to a contemporary Comte de Saint-Pol. The italics are mine.

J'ay veu Saint Pol en gloire  
Ravy jusques *es cieus*  
Puis descendre *en bas loure*,  
Mal en grace des dieux     <sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Though I have not elsewhere found this *loure* without its final *e*, we may note that in v. 516 it precedes *et*. Moreover, the two forms of *lour* < *lucrum* suggest a common uncertainty in cases where liaison leveled pronunciation. For the addition of an *e*, cf. *loure* for *lour* "dormouse" = *glus* (Godefroy). My thanks are due to Dr. Spitzer for calling my attention to falconry in this connection.

<sup>5</sup> Noël Dupire, *Les Faicts et dictz de Jean Molinet*, I (Paris, 1936), 304.

Again, in a dialogue of birds (it, too, with political significance) the owl addresses the wren:

Tu fus des oiseaux *de ton lore*  
Plus reboutté que ung mandeglore

Noel Dupire understands the word in these lines as "état" or "condition," and the sense of the passages hardly allows one to depart much from that definition. Its identity with "leurre" is proven by Molinet's using the same form elsewhere for "lure" in a literal sense, e.g. "En ce vergier où je tendis mon loirre." Meyer-Lubke (*REW*<sup>3</sup>, 5131) points out that *loire* is the Provençal form from Germanic *lōþr*, which French falconers borrowed from the south and among whom it appears to have replaced the old French *luerre* of the same derivation.

The steps of its transition to the figurative sense of "condition" are indicated by the above quoted "oiseaux de ton lore." Bearing out the implication that the lure varied with birds of various training or age, are these 17th century words of Simon Latham: "As soone as your hawke will come to the lure garnished with meate," he directs, "stay not long in that kinde. Then let her see a live Dove at the lure."<sup>7</sup> And no less an authority than Frederick II discusses the lure at some length. Though he himself, we are told, preferred a lure of crane's wings, the south French and Spanish used live hens, and the falconers "in insula de Armenia," a small pig covered with the skin of a hare.<sup>8</sup>

Hence birds brought from abroad might well have been distinguished from those trained at home by the lure with which they were familiar, while the condition or state of young hawks might be indicated in the same fashion. The broad figurative use which Molinet in the 15th century and Gautier's anonymous author in the 13th make of *loire* may never have been common outside of falconers' circles, but in their verses it seems clearly one of the many metaphors drawn from the vocabulary of the hunt.<sup>9</sup> As rela-

M Dupire does not discuss *loire* in his "Mots rares des Fauctz et dictz de J. M.," *Romania*, LXV, 1 seq.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 651.

<sup>7</sup> Simon Latham, *The Faulcon's Lure and Cure* (London, 1633).

<sup>8</sup> C. H. Haskins, "Frederick II, De arte venandi," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXXVI (1921), 352-353. I may add that the *Livre du Roy Modus* furnishes no relevant examples.

<sup>9</sup> See Arsène Darmesteter, *La Vie des mots*, 97-98. To his list might be added *chaperonner* and *voler* as examples from falconry.

tive examples, I note *alurer* and *délurer* which Bloch derives from falconry, and which illustrate further metaphorical usage <sup>10</sup> *Délurer* especially is of interest since its rarity suggests how completely a given word and sense may resist discovery in the exploitation of available texts. Ancient though its form and root suggest it to be, Bloch finds no trace of it before 1807.

For the other word of verse 516, *retor*, we have in Froissart the meaning "résidence." La Curne de Sainte Palaye, *s v retor*, quotes "Là [à Calais] estoit lors souverains retours." The original meaning seems to have been "asylum" or "place of refuge", and in this sense Godefroy, *s v retor*, cites Marie de France

Kar il i volt avoir *retur*  
E le repaire e le *sejur*

Here the transition to "résidence" is caught under way.

We may consequently understand verse 516 of *Gautier* as "Dis-moi où tu es né, ta condition et ton lieu de résidence." This is a question perfectly in harmony with Gautier's answer. It is reflected in the heroine's charge to her messenger, and itself reflects the concern with feudal dignity upon which, and upon which alone, the success of Gautier's love appears to depend. In his self-imposed exile, his humble service for love's sake, and the heroine's beauty, there are all the elements of a little "roman d'aventure." She questions him, I think, because she feels that the element of "aventure" may be there, that despite his outward state he may be of noble birth. "S'il n'eust haut cuer," she thinks upon hearing his answer, "ja n'offrist tel querele. Entreprendre envers moi vallet a tel cotele." That is the problem which occupies her and the doubt which must subsequently be set at rest.

EDWARD FENIMORE

*The Johns Hopkins University*

#### A POSSIBLE PROVENÇAL SOURCE FOR CHAUCER'S *HOUS OF FAME*, 300-310

In the latter part of Book I of the *Hous of Fame* Chaucer, under the influence of the *Heroides* as well as the *Aeneid*, and perhaps of Boccaccio's *Amorosa Visione*, gives Dido a lengthy complaint

<sup>10</sup> But see Meyer-Lubke, *REW*, *s v ambulare* for another derivation.

against Aeneas The first part of the complaint stirs one's curiosity not only because of its novel indictment of the integrity of men but also because nothing like it is to be found in the sources commonly accepted for any part of the *Hous of Fame*<sup>1</sup> The lines in question read

"Allas' " quod she, "what me ys woo'  
 Allas' is every man thus trewe,  
 That every yer wolde have a newe,  
 Yf hit so longe tyme dure,  
 Or elles three, peraventure?  
 As thus of oon he wolde have fame  
 In magnyfyinge of hys name,  
 Another for frendshippe, seyth he,  
 And yet ther shal the thridde be  
 That shal be take for delyt,  
 Loo, or for synguler profit''<sup>2</sup>

And Chaucer adds immediately

In suche wordes gan to pleyne  
 Dydo of hir grete peyne,  
 As me mette redely,  
 Non other auctor alegge I<sup>3</sup>

In spite of Chaucer's suspicious disclaimer of an "auctor," there does exist a parallel to Dido's bitter summary of male needs—but unfortunately one which raises more questions than it solves One of the *chansons* of a late Provençal poet, Daude de Pradas, is strikingly similar

Daude, an ecclesiastic with a long and distinguished career in the cathedral church of Rodez, lived apparently through nearly the full extent of the thirteenth century, but his poetry may well belong to the first quarter of it.<sup>4</sup> The number of his lyrics of undoubted authenticity is small, but they seem to have been popular among his contemporaries<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Incidentally, the passage receives no comment whatever in any editions, Chaucer handbooks, or special studies with which I am acquainted

<sup>2</sup> Ll 300-310 Ed F N Robinson, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, The Cambridge Poets, New York, 1933

<sup>3</sup> Ll 311-14 *Ed cit*

<sup>4</sup> See A. H. Schutz, *Poésies de Daude de Pradas*, ed with intro and notes, Toulouse and Paris (Bibliothèque Méridionale), 1933 The introduction, pp vii-xviii, gives all the few facts known about Daude's life, which can be dated from ca 1194 to 1282

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, pp vii-viii.

Now in the fourteenth of his *chansons*, an amusing but unclerical *jeu d'esprit*, Daude presents himself as having achieved exactly that desirable condition which, according to Dido, men so deplorably crave. He is especially blessed by Love. He has achieved three women: a *dompna* . . . *per mais valer*, a *puocella*, and a *soudadeira*, who will grant *ab pauc de querer tot so c'Amors vol a jazer*. I quote the complete poem:

Amors m'envida e m somo  
qu'ieu chant e fassa a saber  
cossi m ten Amors en poder,  
o si m'es trop mala o no,  
e pois vei ques il m'en apella,  
e ill sazos, q'ades renovella,  
ben es dreitz qu'en chantan retraia  
coissi m conorta e m'apaia  
uns jois qui s'es e mon cor mes,  
per bon respieich que m'a conques

De totz los bens qu'en amor so,  
ai ieu ara calque plazer,  
car ieu ai mes tot mon esper,  
mon penssar e m'entencio  
en amar dompna coind' e bella,  
e soi amatz d'una puocella,  
e quan trob soudadeira gaia,  
deporte mi cossi qe m plaia,  
e per tant non son meins cortes  
ad amor si la part en tres

Amors vol ben que per razo  
eu am mi donz per mais valer,  
et am puocella per tener,  
e sobre tot qe m sia bo  
s'ab toseta de prima sella,  
qand es frescheta e novella,  
don no m cal temer que ja m traia,  
m'aizine tant que ab lieis jaia  
un ser o dos de mes en mes,  
per pagar ad Amor lo ces

Non sap de dompnei pauc ni pro  
qui del tot vol se donz aver  
Non es dompneis, pois torn'a ver,  
ni cors s'i ren per guizerdo  
Aia n om anel o cordella  
e cuch n'esser reis de Chastella  
Pro es dompneis d'amor veraia,

si joias pren e, qan pot, baia,  
 e l sobreplus teigna Merces  
 en thezaur, e no n done ges

Franca prucella de sazo  
 mi platz, qand m'es de bel parer,  
 e is vai de josta mi sezer,  
 qan sui vengutz en sa maiso,  
 e si l vuoll baisar la maissella  
 o il estreing un pauc la mamella,  
 no is mou ni s vira ni s'esglaiia,  
 anz poigna cum vas mi s'atraia,  
 tro que l baisars en sia pres  
 e l doutz tocars de luoc debes

De soudadeira coind'e pro  
 vuoll qe m don' ab pauc de querer  
 tot so c'Amors vol a jazer,  
 e non fassa plaig ni tensso  
 d'ostar camisa ni gonella,  
 anz danze segon qe l viella  
 cel que non a soing qe is estraia  
 de far tot ioc q'Amors l'atraia,  
 e s'il n'avia mais apres,  
 ja de l'enseignar no is feisses \*

Dido's attack upon the integrity of men, allowing for the natural dramatic difference in point of view between an outraged woman and a complacent man congratulating himself on the joys of love *part en tres*, seems like an abstract of Daude's poem. The added last stinging line, "Loo, or for synguler profit," simply makes the application of the third class more bitterly exact to her own case, wherein she so obviously has been used by Aeneas not merely for his "delyt" but particularly for his "synguler profit."

Daude's *dompna* is, of course, the great lady so essential to all proper courtly lyricists—a being to be adored and served and cherished from afar, from whom physical expression of love was hardly to be expected, whose lover was far more a vassal than a man. Her greatest gift was usually only the increasing of *valer*, that is, as Chaucer so aptly puts it, fame, the magnifying of the name of her lover. The *franca prucella* is quite simply a friend, one who is glad to sit beside Daude when he visits her in her home (*Prucella* means only a *demoiselle* or young lady. It has neither

\* *Ibid.*, pp 69 ff



moral nor amorous connotation) Daude's friend is neither a courtly mistress nor, even though she permits a few familiarities, a harlot But as for the *soudadeira*, she is merely a gay wench taken for "delyt" alone Allowing for the necessary difference in detail between a lengthy exposition and an abstract thereof, the parallelism between Daude's poem and the lines from Chaucer is exact

This raises an interesting problem To say that Chaucer had read Daude's poem would be to fly in the face of established critical opinion, the idea that Chaucer might have known Provençal having been thoroughly scouted for years<sup>7</sup> Only two Provençalistes have brought it up again in two rather unsatisfactory books H J Chaytor, *The Troubadours and England*,<sup>8</sup> and Jean Audiau, *Les Troubadours et l'Angleterre*,<sup>9</sup> have both shown conclusively that there was an important influence of Provençal upon the development of the English lyric in metrics, stanza forms, content, imagery, etc But while they prove unquestionably the fact of this influence and the possibility of its being direct, so conventional is their material that it is almost impossible to say whether with any given poem the influence is direct or indirect through the north French lyric, itself a Provençal derivative This becomes peculiarly difficult with Chaucer whom Chaytor little more than mentions, but whom Audiau devotes a considerable section to.<sup>10</sup> Unfortunately none of the examples given by Audiau prove more than that the conventionalities of courtly lyric expression are to be found in Chaucer Their parallels are to be found everywhere—in England, Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, as well as in the Midi

<sup>7</sup> Save by the uncritical Sandras (*Étude sur Chaucer*, Paris, 1859, p 122), it has not been entertained since Tyrwhit (in a footnote to Part C of the "Appendix to the Preface" of his ed of *The Canterbury Tales*—I have used Moxon's reprint, London, 1855, in which see p xiii) disposed of the opinions of Rymer, Dryden and Warton Warton, indeed, had gone so far as to state, chiefly because Chaucer refers to the river Oise (l 1928), that he believed the *Hous of Fame* to have been "originally a Provençal composition" (*The History of English Poetry*, p 257 in the reprint of Ward, Lock and Co, London, n d) The opinion is, of course, like the more general opinions of Warton's predecessors, utterly without value For brief but adequate reviews of the problem, see T R Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, New York, 1892, II, 446-449; and E P Hammond, *Chaucer a Bibliographical Manual*, New York, 1908, p 375

<sup>8</sup> Cambridge Univ Press, 1923

<sup>9</sup> 2nd ed, Paris (Librairie J Vrin), 1927

<sup>10</sup> Audiau, *op cit*, pp 87-103

And as for direct Provençal influence, even Audiau is finally forced to say in a footnote.

Le plus souvent, dans l'oeuvre de Chaucer et de Gower, l'imitation des troubadours paraît être indirecte, et provenir soit des trouvères, soit des premiers poètes anglais de l'amour, soit de Pétrarque ou des auteurs italiens du Trecento <sup>11</sup>

All of this makes Chaucer's knowledge of Daude's *chanson* at once more suspect and more important if true. To prove it beyond doubt seems impossible. Nevertheless one further bit of evidence, in addition to the closeness of the parallel, may be mentioned although a division of love into three parts occurs elsewhere,<sup>12</sup> so far as I have been able to discover, the division into *domner*, friendship, and harlotry is used only by Chaucer and Daude. Certainly it is not merely one of the conventions of medieval lyric, either courtly or goliardic. It would seem, therefore, to have more significance than any number of parallel conventionalities.

Moreover, there is nothing inherently far-fetched in the idea that Chaucer might well have read Provençal. For a man well acquainted with fourteenth-century French and Italian, Provençal would be an extremely easy language. Furthermore Chaucer's two trips into Italy may well have forced him to travel through the

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 87, note 1. Audiau adds "Mais que dire quand Gower, par exemple, calque son modèle plus exactement que ne l'a fait l'intermédiaire? Gower n'a-t-il pas eu entre les mains comme Pétrarque, un chansonnier des troubadours?" But this is rendered less likely when we see that Audiau has found only the borrowing of metaphors, never whole poems, and that he has excised lines even to do that. See the misquotation from Daude de Pradas on p. 123. Restoration of the missing line from st. iv of *chanson* II renders Gower's borrowing very dubious.

<sup>12</sup> For example, see the *chanson* beginning "Del menor tertz damor son gran poder" by Giraut de Calanson (Raynouard, *Chansons des poètes originaux des troubadours*, Paris, 1816-21, III, 391-393), and the commentary upon it by Giraut Riquier (Anglade, *Le troubadour Giraut Riquier*, Paris, 1905, pp. 254 ff.). "The least third of love" is sensual love, the second is natural love (love for family, etc.), the first third is celestial love. But this triad sheds no light upon that used by Daude and Chaucer. Oddly enough the only triad that offers any resemblance comes from Demosthenes. My colleague, Dr. F. L. Utley, has pointed out to me that the oration "Against Neaera" contains the statement "Mistresses we keep for pleasure, concubines for daily attendance upon our person, wives to bear us children and be our faithful housekeepers" (Trans. C. R. Kennedy, London, 1889, v, 272).

Midi, the routes from England to Bordeaux and thence through Gascony and Toulouse to Marseille, or to Paris or Orleans and south to Marseille, were among the likeliest for any traveller to pursue<sup>13</sup> Both would take him through lands where the *langue d'oc* was spoken And Genoa, his destination on his first trip, had a long and intimate Provençal tradition

In addition, Provençal must have been known to some extent in London by courtiers and business men at least for more than two centuries after 1154 All during the reigns of Henry II and Elinore of Aquitaine, their sons Richard and John, and their grandson Henry III, who married Elinore of Provence,<sup>14</sup> daughter of Raymond Berenger of Toulouse, Provençal was a language of importance in the conduct of affairs Even such a national hero as Simon de Montfort, although born in north France of mingled French and English ancestry, was intimately connected with the Midi and Provençal affairs. Omitting the tragic record of his father in the destiny of Provence, and even the fact that he was himself governor of Aquitaine (1248-52), one must still point out that he was personally related to many of the princely and noble families of the south<sup>15</sup> And subsequently the villain of the reign of Edward II, Piers Gaveston, was a native Gascon Nor must one forget that during the entire period following 1154 Aquitaine remained in English hands even when the French crown recovered the other lands held by the English in France Furthermore Aquitaine was a center of the continental wars during the reign of Edward III and the supremacy of the Black Prince—a period which ended only in 1377. The Prince was Duke of Aquitaine (as was John of Gaunt later), holding a brilliant court at Bordeaux and Angoulême Richard II was, after all, Richard of Bordeaux.

<sup>13</sup> A third way *via* Lyons and Savoy would have skirted the edge of the Provençal area

<sup>14</sup> Another grandson, Henry's brother Richard of Cornwall, also married a Provençal—Sanchia, sister of Elinore The influence of the Provençal-Savoyard party upon Henry was, in fact, perhaps the most troublesome factor in his very troubled reign

<sup>15</sup> Bémont (*Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester*, trans Jacob, Oxford, 1930, p 67) says "In the south, where his father had won such great renown, he had many affinities a Montfort was reigning at Castres, Alice, a daughter of his brother Guy, had married Jourdain III, the lord of Chabanaïs Alice's mother, Perronelle, countess of Bigorre, had wedded in 1242 . . Boso de Matha, a native of Saintonge, and the daughter of this match had just married Gaston de Béarn "

And last, English commerce with Bordeaux, especially in wines, was important throughout the whole later middle ages—so important that Chaucer's neat summary of the Shipman could include as an essential but matter-of-course detail that that worthy's wine stealing occurred on the trips "fro Burdeux-ward"

Chaucer's own immediate ancestors, be it noted, his father, grandfather, and step-father, were wine merchants. His grandfather was even collector of customs on wines from Aquitaine—a position that would make a knowledge of the language probable. And Chaucer's own Comptrollership of the customs and subsidies of wools, skins, and hides in the port of London and later of the petty customs on wines, etc., make it certain that he must have been more or less in contact for years with people who spoke, among several languages, that of the Midi.<sup>18</sup>

That Chaucer knew enough Provençal to use it for ordinary practical purposes, then, is likely enough. It is not fundamentally improbable that he knew its literature. One may doubt that scholarship will ever show a great direct influence of that literature upon him, but the reason is not necessarily that he was unacquainted with it. The critic must remember that the usual Provençal lyric was not particularly compatible with Chaucer's genius and that the conventionalities of which Provençal poetry is, in the main, so full would obviously interest him less (at least as he matured) than the powerful literatures of the classics, of France and of Italy. Nevertheless one need not be surprised if one finds occasional decorative stuff direct from a Provençal source. Unless a likelier origin is found for the lines quoted at the beginning of this paper, one may assume that Chaucer was somehow acquainted with at least one poem by Daude de Pradas. And finally I should like to suggest that, inconclusive as this paper is, the subject of Chaucer's knowledge of Provençal is worth reconsidering.

ROBERT M. ESTRICH

*The Ohio State University*

---

<sup>18</sup> Such facts make possible the oral transmission, as a joke, bit of light verse or song, of the idea in Daude's poem, or even of the poem itself. It would be careless scholarship to assume on the basis of the present evidence that Chaucer owned a Provençal *chansonnier*—quite as careless as to assume that he did not. Aside from the poem which is the subject of this study, I see no evidence for thinking that he was acquainted with any of Daude's poems.

## CHAUCER'S MONK

Chaucer's Pilgrims are mostly vivid types. They might have been mere labels, they might have been vague colorless types, they might have been notably individual. But the vivid type is more harmonious with the essential nature of poetry, even as actually set forth by critics from Sidney's predecessors down. Its typical character is peculiarly harmonious also with the strong medieval craving for general truths, and its vividness was inevitable to Chaucer with his deep regard for the concrete. This has led him often to verge on an individual look, with local habitations, and names, and more, there is no reason why a Cook particularly should have a mormal on his shin, and the Wife of Bath assuredly is very much her own self. Such special traits as theirs might well be invented for vividness. No doubt many a trait was recalled, by a man of Chaucer's wide acquaintance, from this or that actual person, such traits might even though rarely be recovered by a student from oblivion (as at times perhaps by Mr. Manly), even by extraordinary luck in sufficient numbers to justify calling one of the descriptions something of a portrait. But the suggestion that *The So-and-So is Such-and-Such* would be almost always unprovable and also too exact. It is risky to believe that a pilgrim who shows individual-seeming traits had a single actual model any more than one more generalized had, or even was designed to recall a single individual. The Pilgrims as a rule body forth traits which mark a well-developed average or better or worse member of their class. By showing resemblances to certain actual persons of the class for whom there is record, the truth to type has been enforced upon us by many critics, especially by Mr. Manly, and now in case of the Monk by Miss Bressie.<sup>1</sup> The former's parallels between some Pilgrims and actual persons he announces not as proof that the poet was portraying actual persons but as "suggestions of a more or less speculative character", Miss Bressie evidently would like to claim more, too much.

The Monk is shown in the *Prolog* as not young, an important man, a "lord" and a "prelate" (172, 200, 204). Therefore presumably he belongs to an important house, for he is not abbot

<sup>1</sup> "A Governour Wily and Wys," in *MLN*, LIX, 477-490 (1939), J. M. Manly, *Some New Light on Chaucer* (N. Y. 1926)

but merely an "out-rider," in charge of monastic estates, and seemingly a prior (172) He is physically attractive and vigorous, without ridicule he is also worldly, no student, free-and-easy,<sup>2</sup> a sportsman, a gourmet, and handsomely dressed His elaborate golden pin with a love-knot in the larger end (196-7) is merely a worldly touch and fashion, like the Prioress' golden brooch with its sentimental (not mystical) inscriptions This is essentially all There is no reason to see much if any sarcasm from the duly worldly Chaucer, who really esteemed the man, and surveyed the great economic institution of monasticism as it actually was in his day, and not with our own superficially historical and bird's-eye view Like the Friar<sup>3</sup> he seems generic, not specialized There is no indication of the house or even order he belongs to, but of course he is a Benedictine monk of one or other variety In spite of modern inexperience no medieval would use "Monk" of an Augustinian canon when he daily passed on the street both kinds of religious in their characteristic garb, Chaucer thus recognizes his own Canon (*C. Y P*, 557-73), and it is a wonder it took him so long The Monk scouts both Benedict and Augustine, but so might an easy-going Communist Russian in private slur both Stalin and Trotsky Such very moderate severity as there was in either order became relaxed in lax times In sketching out the *dramatis personae* there is not the smallest reason to assume that Chaucer had any other detail in mind than appears here Further implications later in the *Tales* may well have been later thought up To infer facts for which there is no sound evidence in a man created by the imagination is to be blind to the fundamental difference between interpreting him and a man who has really lived, a subject discussed elsewhere,<sup>4</sup> and by many critics surprisingly ignored.

When the Monk reappears he is substantially the same The Host, having earlier hocus-focused the lots to secure the Knight first, highest among the laity, drops the mask in the *Miller's Prolog* (3118), and calls next directly on the Monk, highest among the clergy An even nicer touch comes from the Prioress; like many good women she does not distinguish between goodness and pious

<sup>2</sup> A subtle touch of reality is (l 183) "I seyde his opinion was good", the past tense suggests Chaucer's chat with him at the Tabard Inn

<sup>3</sup> With whom there is conflict of evidence as to his order between the *Prolog* and later parts (*MLN*, I, 289-92)

<sup>4</sup> "The People in Chaucer's *Troilus*," to appear later in *PMLA*

conformity, nor see herself and others in the same picture, and though worldly herself forgets her unfitting fashionable brooch when she probably glances at the Monk askance in saying of the abbot who buries her little martyr (1832-3),

This abbot, which that was an hooly man,  
As monkes been, or elles oghte be

He figures most of course in the links before and after his tale. Here as before he is "my lord" (3114, 3117, 3119, 3153), prudent and able (3130). But there is one addition. Though the Host does not know his convent (3121), the Monk himself gives a rather clear indication (3160) when he proposes to tell the life of St. Edward. The Confessor was not a specially prominent saint in the fourteenth century, but in one house he loomed large, the mitred Benedictine abbey of Westminster, the most eminent in England. He had refounded it, and his imposing shrine was (and is) venerated behind the high altar. Whether or not specially interested in the abbey previously, Chaucer in 1399 was to become a tenant of it, and therefore in 1400 to have the privilege of interment in the south transept of its great church, but everyone was familiar with the most impressive institution in the London region. The most conspicuous patron saint of his own abbey would be sure to be thought of by any monk when called on to narrate in circumstances which made him acutely conscious of his profession.

And circumstances had just done this,—put the Monk on his dignity. Here I must wholly dissent from Mr. Manly.<sup>5</sup>

Chaucer completely threw over the [Monk] described in the *Prologue* and substituted for him a gloomy and uninteresting person, who retains nothing of the original brilliant figure except the horse with its jingling bells.

To others, on the contrary, the Monk's Prolog has seemed one of the most vivid and consistent passages in the whole poem. A vigorous and expansive man like him, if of eminent position, will freeze into austerity if a tactless upstart goes too far in familiarity. The story is told of King Edward VII when Prince of Wales that he had taken a fancy to a certain vivacious youth, for whom therefore his friends foretold a brilliant social future, but the youth made so bold as to slap Albert Edward on the back,—and promptly disappeared from the entourage. Theodore Roosevelt, it is said, on

<sup>5</sup> *Some New Light on Chaucer*, pp. 222, 261-2.

a horseback journey in the farther West was bawled at by an urchin as "Teddy!", Roosevelt jumped off in anger and pursued him with his riding-crop. Chaucer's Host, always in his element while managing the commoner sort, is ill at ease with his betters, uneasily obsequious with the Prioress, and now with the Monk presumptuous,—full of personal questions, and with peculiarly free speech chaffing him on the waste of his masculinity in the state of celibacy. "This worthy Monk took all in patience" (3155, which shows the poet's awareness of a conflict), but pungently rebukes him by meeting his demand for a tale with an offer to "tell a tale, or two, or three,—so far as makes for decency" (3157-8),—"the life of Saint Edward or else tragedies." The Monk in his revived dignity even recalls his by-gone education, defines tragedy, and discourses on its literary form. Thus with Chaucer's frequent dramatic irony the very means the Host adopts to obtain a jolly tale produces one of the heaviest. The tale has its impressiveness, was admired in later generations, and indeed helped set a literary fashion, but Chaucer probably felt, and shows, a touch of our feeling. It is true that even the crude Host, having just stunted the preceding speaker of his tale, hesitated to take such initiative again with an important man who had lately snubbed him, but we can picture him making imploring signals to the chief man of the party, and at all events seconds the Knight's protest against this gloomy tale, with his habitual and perhaps now resentful bumptiousness.<sup>6</sup> The Monk receives this double check with the same dignity as before, but more laconically. In this combination of force, cultivation and high self-respect I do not perceive Mr. Manly's "sad-faced pedant," "gloomy and uninteresting person." In what at first seems plodding or unaccountable in Chaucer we can detect at times high subtlety, which Mr. Manly recognizes as well as anyone, and which may be accepted as meant if it contradicts nothing else.<sup>7</sup>

Miss Biessie in showing parallels between the Monk and William de Cloune, abbot of the Augustinian canons at Leicester from 1345 to his death in 1378, makes us feel the more how normal or lifelike

<sup>6</sup> He has learned nothing from the Monk's rebuke of him, for next he not only calls on the Nun's Priest with familiar chaff, but after the tale chaffs him too on his wasted masculinity (4638-44) in the same terms he had used to the Monk. (Cf certain remarks in *PMLA*, I, 113-5.)

<sup>7</sup> A good example is in T. A. Knott's "A Bit of Chaucer Mythology," on the poet's self-portrait in *Sir Th. Prolog* (*Mod. Philol.*, VIII, 135-9).



are some of the Monk's habits and tastes. But if we scrutinize her heap of facts and winnow away matters dubious or irrelevant to Chaucer, we find nothing even to suggest reminiscence except that he was called a notable hunter of hares, was known to the court and belonged to a prosperous house. There were many such monks. Most of her information about de Cloune comes from Knighton's chronicle, who was a canon of this abbey, and therefore may well have inflated the abbot's importance. Even if we should unwisely seek a single prototype for a Benedictine prior we need not accept an abbot of Augustinian canons. The mere fact that de Cloune died some nine years before the probable date of the *Prolog* does not fully prove that he was not in Chaucer's mind,—but still less (as Miss Bressie apparently would like to think) that for part of the *Prolog* we should reconsider this date.

J S P TATLOCK

*The University of California*

#### TRIVET'S CONSTANCE AND THE *KING OF TARS*

Commentators on Chaucer's *Man of Law's Tale* have repeatedly pointed out that his source—the Constance story by Trivet—deviates from the large number of analogues in one striking feature: the substitution of an entirely new episode in place of the heroine's escape from an incestuous father.<sup>1</sup> Instead, Trivet gives us the story of his heroine's ill-starred marriage to a Saracen monarch who fell in love with her when merchants brought him reports of her beauty. Trivet's purpose was obvious—to avoid a *motif* which must have been distasteful to him, as it apparently was to Chaucer, who also disliked “unkinde abhominaciounes.” But no critic has so far made any suggestion as to the story used by Trivet in revising the beginning of the tale he wished to tell. There is reason to suppose, I believe, that he chose as model an edifying romantic theme which was most popular during the time when he was writing the *Chronique*, in the early fourteenth century. The story, which I have elsewhere proved reached England soon after 1300,<sup>2</sup> recounts

<sup>1</sup> For discussion, see Margaret Schlauch, *Chaucer's Constance and Accused Queens* (New York, 1927), Chapter I, and pp. 132-134.

<sup>2</sup> The date and the relation of the *King of Tars* to a number of hitherto unknown versions are discussed in my dissertation (New York University, 1939).

the marriage of a Tartar khan and an Armenian princess, and was very popular, versions appearing in Italian and German chronicles and in a number of Latin MSS in England, France, Germany, and Spain. The Middle English version is the *King of Tars*<sup>3</sup>. Of course, many details are common not only to the Trivet version and the *King of Tars* or its analogues, but to analogues of the *Man of Law's Tale*, and to other romances as well: for example, the report of the princess's great beauty, the Sultan's uncontrollable desire to wed her although he has never seen her, the girl's distaste for the proposed marriage, and the accusation of having borne a monstrous child. In the following details, however, the Trivet version<sup>4</sup> seems closer to the various versions of the *King of Tars* than to any analogues thus far cited, both Trivet and the *King of Tars* and its analogues stress not merely the beauty and chastity of the heroine, but especially her *Christian* piety and devoutness, in both the inducing cause for the marriage is the hope of peace and amity between Christians and Saracens, in both the Sultan sends letters promising the Christians freedom of trade and worship and agreeing to relinquish the city of Jerusalem and other holy places to the Christians,<sup>5</sup> in both he sends letters to the Pope, in both he shows the bride with lavish gifts, in both she is accompanied by members of the clergy, knights, and others when she leaves her home<sup>6</sup>.

These details of the marriage arrangements, similar to the account in the *King of Tars* or its analogues, seem very significant. Some traces of the *motif* of the incestuous father are still present in Trivet (and in Chaucer's *Man of Law's Tale*). Yet the actual marriage in both Trivet and the *King of Tars* is determined by

<sup>3</sup> Printed by F. Krause, "Kleine Publicationen aus der Auchinleck-hs," *Englische Studien*, xi (1887-88), 33-63.

<sup>4</sup> The story of Constance from Nicholas Trivet's *Chronicle* is reprinted in *Originals and Analogues of some of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, 2nd Ser. (Chaucer Society, 1872), pp. 2 ff., see *Originals and Analogues of Chaucer's C. T.*, 2nd Ser., ed. by F. J. Furnivall, Edmund Brock, W. A. Clouston (Chaucer Society, 1888), Items 1, 2, 3, 13, 18, pp. 1, 55, 71, 221, 365.

<sup>5</sup> *Acta Aragonensia Quellen aus der diplomatischen Korrespondenz Jaymes II*, ed. H. Finke (Berlin, 1908), II, 746, and III, 90, G. Villani, *Istorie Fiorentine* (Milan, 1802), IV, 51, see Gilles le Muisit, *Chronique et Annales* (Paris, 1906), 114, *Annales Regis Edwardi Primi*, Rolls Series, XXVIII, pt. 2, 443.

<sup>6</sup> Villani, *Istorie Fiorentine*, IV, 52.

political and religious considerations. Political events in the Near East and the increasing enthusiasm for a Crusade during the first decade of the fourteenth century had provided ample reason for the popularity and currency of such a tale. In 1299, Ghazan, Khan of the Tartars, in alliance with the Christian kings of the East, had conquered Damascus, released the Christian prisoners, and announced that when the Egyptians were driven from Palestine (with the hoped-for aid from Western Christians) he would restore the Holy Land to the Christians. His victory at Damascus created wild enthusiasm in the West,<sup>7</sup> and his name was immediately linked in marriage with that of a Christian princess of Armenia, through whose persuasion and the attendant miracles he was supposed to have been converted to Christianity. Granting Trivet's initial desire to change the first part of the traditional story, it is obvious why he would turn for his opening situation to this incident which was currently popular and accepted as historical.

Reference to the *King of Tars* also helps to clarify an otherwise inexplicable situation in the opening pages of Trivet's version. In Trivet's story, the bride leaves her home amidst great sorrow and lamentation, but the reason for this general misery is not apparent, for the Sultan groom has already agreed to accept the Christian faith and gives every indication of being an admirable spouse. In the *King of Tars* the Christian princess consents to the marriage only after threats of further war, and when she leaves to marry a heathen Sultan her departure naturally evokes much pity. It is only after a miracle subsequent to the marriage that the heathen Sultan in the *King of Tars* consents to the baptism. Trivet by substituting a Sultan already converted would seem to eliminate also the chief reason for the bride's sorrow, which in his version remains an unexplained survival, until we recall the situation in the *King of Tars*. It is to be noted also that Trivet has his heroine born on St. John's day, this has no significance in his tale, whereas in the *King of Tars* the monstrous child is baptized, on the saint's day and named John. Trivet and the *King of Tars* agree in another significant theme. The *motif* of religious hypocrisy is peculiar to the *King of Tars* and does not occur in its analogues. In the Mid-

<sup>7</sup> Almost every chronicle of the period mentions this battle, see *Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires Relatifs à l'Histoire de France*, ed. L. G. Michaud (Paris, 1854), II, 177.

dle English poem, the princess pretends to adopt her husband's faith, in Trivet, the Sultan's mother pretends to adopt Christianity. The example of the heroine of the *King of Tars* may have suggested to Trivet this convenient method of explaining the mother-in-law's conduct as motivated not by primitive fear and jealousy of substitution by the son's bride,<sup>8</sup> but by the Sultaness' religious zeal, the pretense of conversion thus provides the false Sultaness with the opportunity to murder the Sultan and then to dispose of Constance. It seems therefore likely that Trivet knew the tale of the marriage of the Tartar khan and the Aimemian princess and that he adopted certain elements from that story to account for Constance's peregrinations without reference to the incestuous father.

LILLIAN HERLANDS HORNSTEIN

*New York University*

## CHAUCER AND THE LITURGY

### I

It has been pointed out for many years in various ways by scholars that Chaucer was a Catholic, and as such, of course, possessed some knowledge of the beliefs, practices, and customs of the Church. His awareness of the abuses inside the Church is obvious in some of the characters of the *Canterbury Tales*, notably in the scornful and unsavoury portrait of the Pardoner. That he was tediously familiar with the usual sermons on the seven deadly sins, the *Parson's Tale* shows. Some suggestion has also appeared that Chaucer was well acquainted with the manuals of the Church, the missal and the breviary.

Here I wish to show that while Chaucer took the general plan and indeed translated literally much of Jacobus de Voragine's version of the St. Cecilia legend for the *Second Nun's Tale*, and, as Professor Tatlock has demonstrated, perhaps a version of the tale translated from Simeon Metaphrastes,<sup>1</sup> he might have used still another Latin life as secondary source. That was one quoted in his breviary, which he probably found valuable either to verify the Jacobus story or as furnishing additional material.

<sup>8</sup> Schlauch, *Chaucer's Constance and Accused Queens*, 134.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *MLN*, 45 (1930), 296 S, and *PMLA*, 45 (1930), 169 ff.

Professor Robinson states in reference to the lines

"O juge, confus in thy nyctee  
Woltow that I reneye innocence,  
To make me a wikked wight?" quod shee

"Chaucer here departs considerably from his original"<sup>2</sup> Since the Jacobus story does not contain this speech,<sup>3</sup> Chaucer not only departed considerably but departed altogether by adding something—and that a very bold speech by a young Christian woman under suspicion and in danger of losing her life as her husband and brother-in-law had already lost theirs The Simeon Metaphrastes version contains these words

Dixit Almachijs Praefectus "Elige tu unum ex duobus aut sacrificia, aut nega te esse Christianum, et delicti tibi detur venia" Tunc dixit ridens sancta Caecelia "O Iudicem pudore necessario affectum! Vult me negare, et esse me innocentum, ut ipse me faciat crimini obnoxiam Si vis accusare, cur me abhortaris, ut negem? Sin autem vis absolvere cur non vis inquirere?"<sup>4</sup>

It is possible that this too was a secondary source of the tale, but it is reasonable to suppose that Chaucer consulted his breviary The account in the Sarum breviary seems a somewhat closer source for the amazing speech<sup>5</sup> In the office for St Cecilia's day, the lesson for the third nocturne, appear these words

Tunc subridens Cecilia dixit, O iudicem necessitate confusum Vult ut negem me esse innocentem ut ipse me faciat nocentem.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Chaucer, Geoffrey, *Complete Works*, ed F N Robinson (Student's Cambridge Edition), Boston, 1933, G 463-5 Notes p 866

<sup>3</sup> Jacobus de Voragine, *La Légende dorée*, traduite du Latin d'après les plus anciens manuscrits par Téodor de Wyzewa Paris, 1920, pp 643 4 Alors Almaque "Laisse maintenant tes folies, et sacrifie aux dieux!" Et Cécile "C'est toi qui me parais atteint de folie car, la où tu vois des dieux, nous ne voyons que des pierres Etends la main, et constate du moins par le toucher ce que tes yeux ne parviennent pas à voir!"

<sup>4</sup> Surius, *Historia seu vitae sanctorum*, Turin, 1878 xi, 653 (Auct Sim Metaphraste, Habetur Tomo v Alloyau)

<sup>5</sup> The suggestion for this point came from Professor Howard R Patch The *Sarum Breviary* from which this edition has been made was printed in 1531, and earlier copies are extant from 1508 There were, however, breviaries in use long before this time, even as early as 1099 So it is likely that the 1531 edition was reprinted from earlier editions

<sup>6</sup> *Breviarium Sarum*, ed Francis Procter and Christopher Wordsworth Cambridge, 1886 iii, column 1079.

This passage, more than being a mere verbal echo, is almost literally what Chaucer incorporated into his story. It seems proof that he was familiar with the breviary account of the St Cecilia legend, and may have turned to it for the special dramatic value of this speech.

## II

Chaucer's use of the liturgy appears also in the prayer of Constance (*Man of Law's Tale*) to the Holy Cross. She prays

"Victorious tree, proteccioun of trewe,  
That oonly worthy were for to here  
The Kyng of Hevene with his woundes newe,  
The white Lamb, that hurt was with a spere,  
Flemere of feendes out of hym and here  
On which thy lymes feithfully extenden  
Me kepe, and yif me myght my lyf t'amenden" <sup>7</sup>

Mr Robinson notes in regard to these lines (quoting from Skeat) that similar addresses to the Cross may be found in the hymn "Lustra sex qui iam peregit" of Venantius Fortunatus,<sup>8</sup> but he does not mention the fact that portions of this hymn and of another hymn to the Cross which these lines also reflect, "Pange lingua gloriosi," appear in the breviary as antiphons and in the missal as part of the ritual of the Mass.

The prayer of Constance is a free translation of certain antiphons in the office for the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (September 14),<sup>9</sup> and the complete hymn is sung in the Mass of the Pre-sanctified on Good Friday.<sup>10</sup>

It is the fifth verse of the hymn "Lustra sex" which seems of particular significance to me

Sola digna tu fuisti  
Ferre pretium saeculi  
Atque portum praeparare

<sup>7</sup> Chaucer, *op cit*, p. 80, B 456-462. The suggestion for this point came from Professor Howard R. Patch.

<sup>8</sup> Chaucer, *op cit*, Notes, p. 798.

<sup>9</sup> *Breviarium Sarum*, *op cit*, column 818. To show that this hymn was used as an antiphon even earlier than the Sarum Breviary, we may note that it is also quoted in Gregory's *Liber Antiphonarum*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, Paris, 1895. Column 677.

<sup>10</sup> *Missale Sarum*, ed. F. H. Dickinson. Oxford, 1861-63. II, columns 328-30.

Nauta mundo naufrago  
 Quem sacer cruor perunxit  
 Fusus Agni corpore <sup>11</sup>

Could this passage in the hymn, as it is used either in the Mass or in the office, have suggested its use to Chaucer as appropriate to the circumstance of the queen's departure by sea? This question leads to another. Why did Chaucer, if he thought a prayer appropriate, choose an invocation to the Cross? Why not one to the Virgin, to whom Constance in her sorrow did have devotion? <sup>12</sup> The reason, I believe, is that Chaucer was perfectly familiar with the missal, and could not avoid knowing that the votive Mass for the protection of travelers by sea beseeches the aid of the Cross for a safe harbor. The postcommunion prayer of this Mass reads

Sanctificati divino mysterio, maiestatem tuam, Domine, suppliciter exoramus, ut navigantes famulos tuos in te confidentes, per lignum sanctae crucis a cunctis proteges benignus periculis <sup>13</sup>

The "Victorious tree" prayer of Constance is not found in the Gower version of the story in the *Confessio Amantis*, for it is one of Chaucer's particular contributions to the story, an addition that intensifies the pathos of the incident and heightens the spiritual quality of the queen as she is portrayed by Chaucer. In any case, the passage is interesting in itself, not only for the color it gives the atmosphere of the tale, but also for the evidence it gives of the poet's use of the liturgy and of his familiarity with it. Since prayers and hymns to the Cross occur several times during the ecclesiastical year, it is not surprising that Chaucer should paraphrase any one of them. Nor is it surprising that Constance's hazardous marine adventures should suggest to the poet the special need for the protection recommended by the Church on such occasions.

MARY-VIRGINIA ROSENFELD

South Bend, Ind.

---

<sup>11</sup> Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica*, Leipzig, 1886-1922 II, 44 f

<sup>12</sup> Chaucer, *op cit*, p 85, B 841 ff

<sup>13</sup> *Missale Sarum*, *op cit*, columns 820 l

## SOME FURTHER CHAUCER ALLUSIONS

Among the sixteenth and seventeenth century books of heraldry and the dictionaries there are many interesting allusions to Chaucer. Some of these which have heretofore escaped notice I have recently gathered

1 Wyrley, William *The True Use of Armorie, shewed by Historie, and plainly proved by example* Imprinted at London, by I Jackson, for Gabriell Cawood 1592 P 75 In "Lord Chandos The Glorious Life and Honorable Death of Sir Iohn Chandos," occurs this reference

On munday armd like youthfull *Troylus*  
And fresh as he in all his iolitie,  
As stirring, weldie, and as chevalrous  
As *Chaucer* makes him in felicitie,  
Past *Iohn* of Gaunt

2 Bolton, Edmund *Elements of Armorie* London, 1610 P 156 In discussing the use of the word *red* to designate some other colors, the author says, "and for our vulgai, Chauceis rime of Sir Thopas, shall give you an authoritie, where it is said,

'His shield it was of gold so ied,'"

3 Holme, Randle *The Academy of Armory* Roxburghe Club, 1905 (This is the second part of Holme's work on heraldry, and it was complete when the first part was published in 1688. The manuscript of the whole treatise was finished by 1649) P 320 Of the Mantle Holme says, "Of this kind of habite the famous Si Geoffrey Chaucei makes mention in the Knights tale where describing the habits and Ornaments of two combatants entering the list, hath these verses

'Came riding like the God of Armes Mars  
His coate Armour was of cloth of Tharce,  
A Mantle of his shoulder hanging  
Beautifull of Rubies red as fire sparkling'

From whence we may collect, that frome the hanging on his shoulders it did cast itselife in so many plaits (as naturally all garments of large size doe) which form of plating in the art of paint-



ing is termed drapery or fouldage, but in the termes of Herauldry is blazoned, Doubling."

4 Blount, Thomas *Glossographia or a Dictionary*, . London, 1656

a "Agrise (Saxon) afraid *Chaucer*"

b "Alnath is a fixed star in the horns of *Aries*, from whence the first mansion of the Moon taketh his name, and is called *Alnath Chaucer*"

c "Barbican or Barbicane *Chaucer* useth the word *Barbican*, for a Watch-Tower, hence *Barbican* by *Red cross-street* in *London* is thought to take its denomination"

d "To Cheve (Sax) to thrive *Chaucer*"

e "Covent or Convent (*conventus*) The whole number of religious persons dwelling in one house together, which according to *Chaucer* in the *Sompners Tale*, is but thirteen, *viz* twelve and the Confessor"

f "Creance (Fr) trust, faith, belief, confidence, also credit, & *Chaucer*"

g "Disshaveled, or Discheveled (from the French *deschevelé*) an old word used by *Chaucer*, and still in use, and signifies as much as bare-headed, bare-haired, or the hair hanging down disorderly about the ears *Min*"

h "Lodemanage, is the hire of a Pilot for conducting a Ship from one place to another, *Chaucer* makes this word to signifie the skill or art of Navigation"

i "Losenger (Sax) flatterer or lyar *Chaucer*"

j "Ouch (Sax) a kind of collar of gold, or such like Ornament, which women did wear about their necks It is mentioned *An 24 H 8, cap 13* And is sometimes used for a Boss or button of gold *Chauc*"

k "Pilgrim (*Peregrinus*) one that travels into strange Countreys, commonly taken for him that goes in devotion to any holy place, a *Pilgrim* and a *Palmer* differed thus, the *Pilgrim* had some dwelling place, the *Palmer* none The *Pilgrim* travelled to some certain place, the *Palmer* to all, and not to any one in particular The *Pilgrim* might go at his own charge, the *Palmer* must profess wilful poverty The *Pilgrim* might give over his profession, the *Palmer* must be constant, till he had obtained the *Palm*, this is, victory over his ghostly enemies, and life, by death *Chaucer*"

l "Romance (Span) a feigned History, either in Verse or Prose in the Vulgar Language, the first news we heard of this word, was from a Poem writ in French by *John Clopinel* alias *Meung*, intituled *Le Romant de la Rose*, and afterward translated into English by *Geffrey Chaucer*, "

m "Romant *Chaucer* useth it for a brief History"

n "Taberd or Tabard (Sax) It is also the signe of an ancient Inne in *Southwark*"

DOROTHY F ATKINSON

University of Idaho

## GALLOWAY AND THE ROMANCES

When one realizes that a princeling like Alan of Galloway in the early thirteenth century had a poet of north-west France writing the interesting and somewhat neglected romance of *Fergus*<sup>1</sup> at his wild and remote court, one is tempted to exclaim, "Then how much more must such literary activity have flourished in the cultivated circles of the great English barons!" Reasonable as this would be, a moment's consideration gives one pause, for Galloway, meaning the country both north and south of the Solway Firth, was for the Middle Ages a land of special character, a land of romance.

As early as William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum*, c 1125,<sup>2</sup> Galloway was called the kingdom of the greatest Gawain. It was the farthest limit of English sway on the island, an ally in the Welsh and Irish wars, a ferocious foe in the Scottish campaigns. About Carlisle English, Scottish and Celtic chivalry fought and fraternized. More of mystery attached to it than to nearer Wales. At any rate it is practically synonymous with the otherworld in several early romances, for example in the *Perceval*,<sup>3</sup> and it is probably one of the saint's ports in Chrétien's *Guillaume d'Angleterre*<sup>4</sup>. This was the home of Hugh de Morville,<sup>5</sup> who in 1193 carried to Germany the French romance of Lancelot which Ulrich von Zatzikhoven translated. He was lord of Burg on Sands by the

<sup>1</sup> Edited by E. Martin, Halle, 1872. Verwijs and Verdam's edition of the Dutch *Ferguut* has recently been re-edited by Dr G. S. Overdiep, in the *Bibliothèque van Middelnederlandsche Letterkunde*, Leiden, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> Book III, under the year 1087, § 287 of the *Church Historians of England*, III, London, 1844. The date of *Gesta Regum* has been disputed, see Bruce's *Evolution of Arthurian Romance*, II, 98 n., Faral's *Légende Arthurienne*, II, 408, but Tatlock adheres to 1125, *Proc. Amer. Philosoph. Soc.*, LXXIX (1938), 698.

<sup>3</sup> Ll 6602 etc. See A. Hilka's note to l 6602 in his edition, *Der Percevalroman*, Halle, 1932. Cf E. Brugger in the *Kastner Miscellany*, p. 102, n. 3, J. L. Weston, *Legend of Sir Perceval* (London, 1906), I, 191-2, 229 and II, 200, 203 n.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by W. Foerster, *Der Karrenritter und Das Wilhelmsleben*, Halle, 1899, who does not accept this identification, p. clxxx. Cf Hilka in the above note.

<sup>5</sup> On Hugh de Morville see the *Dictionary of National Biography*, to be compared with an article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1856, II, 381, and with some notes of mine in an unpublished dissertation of 1902 in the Harvard library.

Solway Firth, and forester of Cumberland, that is of the romantic Inglewood Forest,<sup>6</sup> scene of the *Aunters of Arthur* and of the *Wedding of Sir Gawain*.<sup>7</sup>

The significance of the region has of course not gone without remark—one thinks of the Tristram controversy. Miss Weston emphasized it in her *Sir Perceval*, and R. H. Griffith in his *Sir Perceval of Galles* (Chicago, 1911, pp. 129 etc.) has brought together evidence that the Perceval story took shape in this part of Cumbria. Yet these scholars did not avail themselves of *Fergus*, which would have strengthened their case, for its hero is probably a Perceval by lineal descent from the original unsophisticated Galwegian youth who so took the fancy of the age. In this romance the knight called Perceval provides only the curtain-raiser of three hundred lines in a most vivid account of the hunt for the *white stag*, which he alone of all Arthur's band pursues to the death at a *ford* by a *thorn*, the episode thus combining three important old motifs intimately connected with the rape of Guinevere and such otherworld adventures. It is the rustic Fergus who has the right Perceval part.

In view of the above, which must be but a tithe of the evidence for literary activity about the Solway Firth, one is led to conjecture that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries this region was a focus of romance the embers of which are the well-known English-Scottish Gawain poems of two centuries later. The circumstance that one of these poems, *Golagros and Gawain*, in its present form most closely resembles a Perceval Continuation, or a print of 1530 (as P. J. Keble concludes in *The Relation of Golagros and Gawain to the Old French Perceval*, Washington diss., 1931), does not

<sup>6</sup> For Inglewood see *The Royal Forests of England*, by J. Charles Cox, London, 1905, pp. 90 f., and the *Victoria History of Cumberland*. It was a district of from 150 to 200 square miles, lying south of Carlisle, and even in the Middle Ages comprising waste, pasturage, arable, manors and hamlets, though it continued to supply deer and timber in Tudor times. The last tree in it fell in 1823.

<sup>7</sup> One might reasonably conjecture that de Morville's romance was written in this region, especially since it resembles *Fergus* in certain rather striking descriptions, of a castle, bog trotting horses, topography. It was obviously written in England, and its action takes place in a landscape very suggestive of Galloway. However, the view of Miss Weston, Singer, and Brugger that Walter Map wrote it seems preferable. On this point I hope to publish an article soon in *Speculum*.

render this suggestion futile, because the *Perceval* and the *Gawain*, having wandered hence in rude habiliments, might at any time return in the new guise of France. There is much to be said for Miss Weston's theory of a great reservoir of *Gawain* poems, upon which the authors of the *Perceval* drew.

Furthermore, there exists an odd bit of evidence that *Golagros* and *Gawain* may be as surprisingly local as Chaucer often is. Golagros holds his courtly towers of no lord, "but everlasting, without allegiance, as his ancestors had done" (ll. 261 f.). "Heavenly God!" exclaims Arthur, "I'll change all that." To this compare the *Victoria History of Cumberland*, I, 306, quoting the *Scottish Antiquary*, xvii, 105-111. "It is one of the most singular eccentricities of territorial conquest that a small corner of ancient Cumbria could be held without title or grant for more than half a century after it had been absorbed into the English kingdom." The place is Gilliesland, seventeen miles northeast of Carlisle, on the Northumbrian frontier, and the last Scotie chief to hold it was Gille, son of Boet. Henry II, probably making the same remark as Arthur, committed it to Hubert de Vaux in 1158, thus normalizing a tenure so strange that it had got into fiction. A castle quite like that of Golagros occurs in *Hunbaut*, ll. 93 f., and elsewhere in the romances, and many of us have been prone to consider such splendid, impregnable, water-girt realms as supernatural—"otherworlds"<sup>s</sup>. Many of them are such, doubtless, but the case of Gille son of Boet should remind us that caution must be exercised in these identifications, as Griffith, p. 125, n. 1, sagely remarks.

Before ending these cursory notes on *Fergus* I should like to remark that the Irish Sea in ll. 17 etc. may perfectly well be the Solway Firth, to which the name was often applied, though I have searched in vain in the Inventories published by the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments and Constructions of Scotland for any such preeminent sea fortress as Somellet's [Soumeillet's] about its shores. Neither do I find any on the Firth of Clyde up to Ayr, near the reputed dwelling of Fergus on Loch Fergus. On the spot one might be able to pick a site, but too much search for these

<sup>s</sup> Cf. Otto Löhmann, *Die Sage von Gawain und dem Grünen Ritter*, Königsberg, 1938, p. 64. Such a case as the above, Löhmann notes, is that of a mortal king who has become so mighty that he undertakes to conquer a supernatural realm.

things is vain. And as for the difficult Ingeval, generally taken to be Galloway, one need not accept the intricate reasoning of Brugger, who makes it the Hebrides.<sup>9</sup> It might be easier to equate it with Inglewood Forest.

K. G. T. WEBSTER

Milton, Mass

# "EINEM DEN HAHNENFUSZ UNTERBREITEN"

In his edition of *Bruder Hansens Marienlieder*, Rudolf Minzloff calls attention to the fact that the proverbial expression *enem den Hahnenfusz unterbreiten* (i. e., to spread the cock's foot beneath one) is as yet not listed in any collection of German proverbs.<sup>1</sup> I have tried, without success, to find it in collections published after 1863, the date of Minzloff's edition of the *Marienlieder*. After learning, however, that Bruder Hans originally lived in the Netherlands and only later settled in southern Germany, I looked for the expression in Dutch paremiological works, and was successful. The expression, so far as I can judge, is limited to the Netherlands. My earliest example is Bruder Hans' allusion of about 1380, and my latest about 1700. After 1700, the expression is not found in texts.<sup>2</sup> Although Bruder Hans was writing in Middle-High-German, the expression never became popular in German, and, thus, is rightly omitted from German collections.

In the few available texts, the expression apparently means, firstly, to confront one with an obstruction to prevent one from acting, and secondly, to catch one in a predicament. The first instance of the expression is Bruder Hans' (ca. 1380) *Nu hant die*

<sup>9</sup> On the very interesting topography see Martin's introduction, Miss Margaret Schlauch in *PMLA*, XLIV (1929), and E. Brugger, *Arthuriana*, II (1929-30), 7 f., *Kastner Miscellany*, pp. 94-107.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Bruder Hansens Marienlieder aus dem vierzehnten Jahrhundert*, ed. Rudolf Minzloff, (Hannover, 1863), p. 117, n. "Einem den hahnenfusz unterbreiten, redensart, die in den deutschen spruchwortsammlungen noch nicht verzeichnet ist."

<sup>2</sup> I do not consider the example given us by Harrebomée, page 2, at this point, for the appearance of the expression in his collection does not absolutely vouchsafe the currency of the expression in the nineteenth century, because Harrebomée drew from all available sources and in this instance mentions no source later than 1700.

*werelt menichfalt, Den hanenvoys ym (dem herzen his better self) unngrebreydet*<sup>3</sup> Here a sinner wanted to repent, but the world thwarted him, unfortunately, by many times spreading the cock's foot beneath (or before) him, i e, frequently preventing his act of repentance, continually holding him in his quagmire of sin A second instance is found in Reyer Gheurtz (1552)<sup>4</sup> This I have not seen A third occurs in G A Bredero's drama *Moortje* (1615), *Maar hola! wie zyn dat? 't is Moyaal met haar meyt, Wat sal ick doen? de Hane-voet is myn ghebreyt. Wat pas ick oock op haar? ick kan my wel verweeren*<sup>5</sup> (Hold on! who are these two? It is Moyaal with her maid, What shall I do? The cock's foot is spread out for me Why am I paying any attention to her? I can indeed look out for myself) Here it clearly means that one is caught in a predicament A fourth, somewhat different, instance is found in J Sartorius' collection of proverbs (1656) in which he classes *De hane-voet is hem gebreyt* as similar to *Hy hengel om de kaars* (i e, he angles [flutters] about the candle), and comments upon it with *in eos dacebatur qui sibi ipsis exitium accersunt*<sup>6</sup> (was said for those who bring destruction, or ruin, to themselves) A fifth example is found in one of J Westerbaen's poems (1672), *Is dat Thais niet? sy is 't, de haenevoeten syn myn gebreydt wat raed? hoe raeck ick hier van daen?* (Isn't that Thais? it is she, the cock's feet are spread out for me What's the advice? How am I to get away from here, then)? This is the only example employing the plural form, *haenevoeten* The meaning of the expression, however, is still the same as in Biedero Westerbaen, probably, only desired to increase the gravity of the predicament by using the plural form, *haenevoeten* P J Harrebomée contributes an example in his large collection of proverbs (1858-70), *De hanevoet is hem*

<sup>3</sup> Cf Minzloff, *ibid*, lines 1614-5

<sup>4</sup> Reyer Gheurtz, *Adagia ofte Spreekwoorde*, (Amsterdam, 1522), p 9, no 31 This reference is from P J Harrebomée, *Spreekwoorden der Nederlandsche Taal*, (Utrecht, 1858-70), I, 265, n 30

<sup>5</sup> *De Werken van G A Bredero*, eds J Ten Brink, H E Moltzer, G Kalf, R A Kollewijn, J H W Unger and J Te Winkel, (Amsterdam, 1890), II, 100, 2456-59 Cf also *Werken van G A Bredero*, ed J A N Knuttel, (Amsterdam, 1924), II, 187, n 1, interprets the expression, "Er is geen ontkomen meer aan"

<sup>6</sup> J Sartorius, *Adagiorum chiliades tres*, (Leyden, 1655), p 243, no 20

<sup>7</sup> J Westerbaen, *Gedichten*, ('s Gravenhage, 1672), II, 291

*gestroord* (of *gebreyd*)<sup>8</sup> Harrebomée makes no comment upon the expression, and cites only Gheurtz and Sartorius. I do not know where he gets the form with *gestroord*, unless it is the form in Gheurtz. The seventh and final example occurs in a seventeenth-century manuscript, of which I give the portion that is cited in the *Woordenboek*. *Was onse maat nou maar by ons Dat ik maar een schuitje haaring kryge kon zonder geld naa Leyye* (Leiden). *Daar heb ik geen zin in, ik zit de haanevoet gebreyd Daar gaan zoo veel schuitje na Holland met honderd duyzend enz*<sup>9</sup> (If our mate were but with us now That I could but get a boat load of herring to Leyden without paying I haven't any desire for that, here I sit the cock's foot spread out So many boats travel to Holland with hundreds of thousands etc.) The text does not enable one to determine the exact meaning of the expression here, but the meaning appears to be similar to that in Bredero and Westerbaen. As near as I can make it out, the person here concerned desires to get his meager cargo of herring to Leyden without paying, but he finds the odds are too great against him. He is truly in a predicament.

The differences in our earliest example of the expression and in those which followed are due, I believe, to an imperfect knowledge of what was meant by *hanenvoys*. To be sure, the degrees of difference in meaning are not great, but the smoothness, in which each example appears in each of the texts, varies considerably in degree. This only shows that the various authors had a fairly good idea of the general meaning of the expression, without any definite knowledge of the meaning of the separate words. This also is too often the case with the use of expressions today. Those who comment upon the meaning of *Hahnenfusz*, with the exception of C. A. Oudemans, Sr.,<sup>10</sup> accept the flower, any one of certain members of

<sup>8</sup> Harrebomée, *ibid*

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Handschriftlyke Letterkunde*, 126, 16 c. This is from the *Woordenboek*, see note 11.

<sup>10</sup> A. C. Oudemans, Sr., *Woordenboek op de gedichten van G. A. Bredero*, (Leyden, 1857), pp. 143-4, "Misschien was het een matrozen-uitdrukking *Hanevoet* althans is een zeker scheepstouw, dat wellicht gebezigd werd om hem, die straf verdiend had, af te ranselen. Het zeggen *De Hanevoet is voor mij gebreyd*, zou dan gelijk staan met *De straf is voor mij klaar*." Although I believe Oudemans hit upon the proper source of the expression, I cannot agree with his interpretation. J. Ten Brink, in the introduction to Bredero's *Moortje* (see above n. 5), says, page 6, "Deze laatste (1859),

the family of *Ranunculaceæ*, as the proper interpretation<sup>11</sup> There is something to be said in favor of this interpretation, for the *Hahnenfusz* is known to be 'troublesome, injurious, and deadly'<sup>12</sup> Despite the material offered in support of the flower, I do not regard the *Hahnenfusz* in our expression as the flower In the first place, the expression, in the light of its use in the various texts, does not necessarily mean that it signify something 'injurious' or 'deadly,'—'troublesome' may well apply to it—but rather that the person concerned is held in check, *i e*, confronted with a predicament hard to escape from, an extremely difficult situation With this latter meaning applied to the expression, a different interpretation for *Hahnenfusz* becomes possible Thus, *Hahnenfusz* may mean an object with perhaps magical qualities capable of diverting or preventing action,<sup>13</sup> *i e*, something similar to the magic penta-

met een 'levensbericht van den dichter en ophelderende aantekeningen' is van A C Oudemans Sr en beleefde in 1884 een tweeden druk," which shows that the editors were familiar with Oudemans' edition The editors also frequently quote from Oudemans' *Woordenboek*, but do not mention him in their comment upon our expression, nor does J A N Knuttel in his note to the expression, see note 5, above Was Oudemans' suggestion so far from the correct answer as not to deserve comment, or were these men not so sure of the answer themselves?

<sup>11</sup> Cf *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*, ('s Gravenhage en Leiden, 1882 ff), V, col 2052, "Hanevoet" Cf also J Ten Brink *et al*, *ibid*, note to line 2458

<sup>12</sup> Cf J David, *Den Doolhof der Ketteren*, (Antwerp, 1605), 3, "De Hanevoeten zijn schadelick, hinderlick, ende dootlick" Cf also Isidoor Tierlinck, *Flora Diabolica*, (Antwerp, 1924), p 114, "In Zuid Holland heet de blaartrekkende Hanevoet (*Ranunculus sceleratus*), de giftigste onzer inlandsche soorten" These qualities attributed to the flower plus Sartorius' remark about the expression probably influenced the interpretation the *Woordenboek* gives to the expression "het eigste staat mij (hem *enz*) te wachten, er is voor mij (hem *enz*) geene uitkomst" Cf *Woordenboek* col 2052, "Hanevoet," 1 A rather early reference to the flower is found in Graff, *Tutiska*, II (1827), 130 Lexer's reference to *Duitska*, in his *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1872), I, col 1168, "hanevuoz," should be corrected to read the same as the above

<sup>13</sup> By way of conjecture, I give the following lest someone conjure up a case for it later In the Middle Ages the Devil was sometimes pictured as having a cock's foot or a horse's hoof, or one of each Cf Kuit Hecksher, *Die Volkskunde des germanischen Kulturkreises*, (Hamburg, 1925), pp 77 and 333, n 44 Cf also M Rudwin, *The Devil in Legend and Literature*, (Chicago and London, 1931), p 45 A legend is still current in Mecklen-



gram, the five-pointed star which was popular in the Middle Ages,<sup>14</sup> or an obstacle of perplexing nature which presents a situation uncertain of solution, or the nautical *Hahnepot* (crow foot) which, I believe, is the correct interpretation. A somewhat far-fetched similarity to the second meaning may be seen in a rather old use of *Hahnenfusz* "fusz eines hahns gern auch bildlich gebraucht, um schlechte schriftzuge zu bezeichnen"<sup>15</sup> Dutch *hanepoot* is also used in the same manner "Onleesbare krabbel in 't mv, als collectief slecht, onleesbar schrift"<sup>16</sup> I do not regard this, however, as having any bearing upon our expression.

Another tempting and interesting possibility might be seen in the *voetangel* or *voetijzer*<sup>17</sup> This was well known in the Middle Ages as a device for obstructing the advancement of military forces. Unfortunately, there is no evidence to support it as the proper meaning of *Hahnenfusz*.

In the nautical *Hahnepot* we have an object rather applicable to our expression. It consists of several small strands of rope threaded

burg to the effect that the Devil has cock's feet, see W. Wissner, "Plattdeutsche Volksmarchen," (*Marchen der Weltliteratur*, n. F., [Jena, 1927]), p. 174. The Devil is notorious for his ability to place one into one predicament after the other. Thus, it is possible that the cock's foot became a symbol of the Devil, and exercised a power of restraint or prevention upon the person before whom it was presented. It was perhaps either scratched in the dirt before the person, or marked upon some object before or near him. The magic qualities of a foot print of one form or another were and still are believed in by the folk, see S. Seligmann, *Die magischen Heil- und Schutzmittel aus der unbelebten Natur*, (Stuttgart, 1927), p. 153. Cf. also *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, III, col. 225, "Fusz," "Sehr viel weisz das Volk von den Fuszen der Zwerge, Dämonen, Geister und des Teufels zu erzählen."

<sup>14</sup> Cf. J. and W. Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, II, col. 1455, "Drudenfusz," 1. Cf. also *Elizabeth Villiers Amulette und Talismane*, revised by A. M. Pachinger, (Berlin, München, Wien, 1927), pp. 252-3, and William and Kate Pavitt, *The Book of Talismans*, (Philadelphia, 1914), pp. 112-3.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Grimm, *ibid.*, IV, col. 167, "Hahnenfusz," 1.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Woordenboek*, V, col. 2048, "Hanepoot," 2, c. Cf. also F. A. Stoett, *Nederlandse spreekwoorden, uitdrukkingen en gezegden*, (Zutphen, 1923), I, 317, no. 829.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. E. Verwijs en J. Verdam, *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek*, ('s-Gravenhage, 1885 ff.), IX<sup>1</sup>, col. 750, "Voetangel," "een wertung met vier (of meer) scherpe punten, die steeds omhoog blijven staan, hoe het ook op den grond geworpen wordt" and col. 756, "Voetiser." Cf. also Grimm, *ibid.*, IV, col. 1012, "Fuszangel," and col. 1018, "Fuszseisen."

through a wooden block, and serves as an instrument for holding a sail in check, for preventing the sail from being injured by the platform at the top of the lower mast<sup>18</sup> Thus, the *Hahnepot* keeps the sail from getting out of place Similarly, in our first example of the expression, the person concerned is prevented from moving out of his sinful surroundings In the later examples, this sense of meaning is retained only in part, i e, the persons concerned are, for the moment, arrested in their action, they don't know their next move, but they are not prevented from overcoming the obstacle later Thus, the expression more generally comes to mean to be caught in a predicament Of interest, also, is the fact that the majority of our examples occur at the time when Dutch activity on the sea reaches a great height At such a period, an excellent opportunity is given 'landlubbers' to become somewhat acquainted with nautical jargon In addition, Bredero comes from a great shipping center, Amsterdam There he contacts men of the sea, and later makes use of this background in his drama *Moortje* Further, our example from the seventeenth-century manuscript definitely attests the familiarity of the expression among seamen<sup>19</sup>

Additional evidence in favor of the *Hahnepot* and against the flower as the proper interpretation of *Hahnenfusz* is found in the

<sup>18</sup> Cf Johann Hinrich Roding *Allgemeines Wörterbuch der Marine*, (Hamburg, 1794), I, col 683, "Hahnepoot," "So nennt man überhaupt eine Anzahl dünner Taue, die sich in einem Centro oder in einem Spinnkopfholz vereinigen (IV, Fig 566 und Fig 51 B B B) Man findet solchen Hahnepoot an den Marssen Die Lienen woraus derselbe besteht, sind an die ganze vordere Seite des Marsses befestigt und fahren in ein Sprietholz oder einen Spinnkopf, der an das Stag genähet ist Es dient dieser Hahnepoot dazu, dass der untere Theil der Marssegel nicht von dem Mars schamvielt werde An der Besahnsruthe oder an der Gaffel befindet sich auch ein Hahnepoot (IV, Fig 528 g g und Fig 286 h), woran der Dirk fährt Derselbe war aber in alteren Zeiten nicht so einfach, sondern hatte fast eben so viele Spützen oder Fusse als derjenige an den Maissen" Cf also *Woordenboek*, III, 1 Stuk, col 2047, "Hanevoet," 2 b

<sup>19</sup> The question of the form *hanevoet* instead of *hanepoot* might be raised against the nautical term To be sure, none of the dictionaries list *hanevoet* with this meaning, and only two, J H Campe, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, (Braunschweig, 1807 ff), II, "Hahnenfusz," and T. Heinsius, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, (Hannover, 1818 ff), "Hahnenfusz," list *Hahnenfusz* with this meaning, but the fact that no one seemed to know the meaning of *hanevoet*, in our expression, and the consistent use of *hanevoet* in our examples give evidence of both forms for the nautical term

Dutch verb *breiden*. Bruder Hans writes *unrgebreydet* in his Middle-High-German example—I have been able to find only a single instance of the use of *strooien* in our expression<sup>20</sup> The *Woordenboek* instructs us to look upon *breiden* in the sense of “Eene stof o v e r iets anders uitspreiden, het er mede bedekken Thans alleen in Zuid-Nederland”<sup>21</sup> Not one of the examples suggests such a condition To be sure, one would not be likely to spread a flower beneath or before one as suggested by *unterbreiten* Thus, *o v e r* would be more applicable than beneath with respect to a flower, but *o v e r* in its emphasized form plus the stipulation *het (iets) er mede bedekken* suggests something rather large, or, at best, several pieces if the article be small, i e, a flower Only once do we find the plural form, and even there (Westerbaen’s example above) it is clear that the person concerned is not covered with anything whatsoever *Breiden* suggests rather the more general meaning “Iets (aan eene of aan meer zijden) uitstrekken, uitsteken enz hetzij naar iemand of iets, hetzij over iets”<sup>22</sup> Here, *over* is given a subordinate place, and simply means over, above, not a covering The verb might also have been *breien* (to weave,

<sup>20</sup> Harrebomee’s instance with *gestrooid* certainly is more applicable to the flower than is *breiden* Even then, one would expect the plural form of *hanevoet* If *gestrooid* is not the form in Gheurtz, I believe Harrebomée, like others before him, did not know the proper interpretation of *hanevoet* in the expression Thus, he chose a verb which best suited the obvious interpretation the flower

<sup>21</sup> Cf *Woordenboek*, v, col 2052, “Hanevoet,” 1, “Breiden in de bet 1, 3” The *Woordenboek* does not mention Gheurtz, but quotes Harrebomée, alone as to the existence of *gestrooid*, and, thus, is influenced to give *breiden* the above meaning Also of interest is the fact that those who interpret *hanevoet* as meaning the flower, the editors of the *Woordenboek* and the editors of Bredero’s works, postdate Harrebomee, the only one who shows the form with *gestrooid* The lack of references and especially of comments upon the expression means one of two things the expression was either extremely common and needed no explanation, or it was very uncommon and no one knew the explanation If the former were the case, then such diligent collectors of proverbs as Tunman, de Cock, Stoett and others surely would not have omitted the expression from their colorful collections Thus, it appears as though the latter be the correct one Sartorius indirectly suggests such a condition when he says, “in eos dicebatur ” which could mean it used to be said (but nowadays the expression is no longer used), at a time when most of our examples occur in texts

<sup>22</sup> Cf *Woordenboek*, III, 1 Stuk, col 1217, “Breiden,” 1, 2

knot or knot), for *bneiden* and *breien* were homonymous in Middle and early Modern Dutch.<sup>23</sup> Then, too, the act of threading the small strands of rope through the wooden block suggests *breien*. Certainly the latter meaning of *bneiden*, or even *breien*, agrees more with the meaning of *unterbreiten*, in our oldest form of the expression, than the meaning suggested by the *Woordenboek*. Thus, if we accept the expression literally, *Hahnenfusz* means not the flower, but rather the nautical *Hahnepot*. The expression, then, is of nautical origin, and decidedly not well known.

STUART A. GALLAGHER

*The University of Chicago*

## THE ENGLISH RIVER-NAMES IN LAWMAN'S *BRUT*

In his so-called *Brut*,<sup>1</sup> Lawman refers to fourteen English rivers. The identity of nine<sup>2</sup> of these is easy and obvious. Five, which offer difficulties of one sort or another, are discussed in the following notes.

### 1 *Stoure* and *Avren*

In the course of the story of the civil war between the British king Lochrine and his wife Gwendoline, which had arisen because Gwendoline had been set aside in favour of Lochrine's mistress, Æstrild, Lawman tells us (2432 ff.) that Gwendoline, sent home to her father Corineus in Cornwall, gathers an army and marches east. After the defeat and death of her husband Lochrine at 'þat water hatte *Stoure* . inne *Deorsete*' (2472-4), Gwendoline marches on 'to þan castle' (2484) where Æstrild and the latter's daughter Abren were and, seizing them, drowns them both 'in ane deope watere' (2489). Lawman goes on to say that Gwendoline

<sup>23</sup> Cf. E. Verwijs and J. Verdam, *ibid.*, I, col. 1423, "Breden," and col. 1427, "Breiden." Cf. also J. Franck, *Etymologisch Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*,<sup>2</sup> ('s-Gravenhage, 1912), p. 91, "Breien."

<sup>1</sup> Frederick Madden ed., *Layamon's Brut*, 3 vols., London, 1847.

<sup>2</sup> *Auene* (*Avene*), 21267AB etc., The Lower Avon (W, So, Gl), *Douglas*, 20068AB etc., Douglas (La), *Humbre*, 2208A etc., Humber (Y, Li); *Seuarne*, 7AB etc., Severn (Montg, Sa, Wo, Gl, Monm, So), *Tambre*, 18677B etc., Tamar (Co, D), *Teine*, 21608A etc., Teign (D), *Temese*, 7403AB etc., Thames (Gl, W, O, Berks, Bk, Sr, Mx, K, Ess), *Uske*, 6001A etc., Usk (Monm), *Waene*, 16172A etc., Wye (He, Monm).

ordered that 'þat like water' (2496)—previously unnamed—should be called *Auren* (1 e. *Avren*) 'for þane maidene Abien' (2499) He then adds (2506), that the river is still called *Auren* (*Avren*) and 'at *Cristes churche* heo falleð 1 þare sae' (2507)

The river *Stoue* (*Stour*), as Lawman thus conceived it, is obviously the *Stour*<sup>3</sup> which rises at Stourhead (W) and flows through Dorset to join the East Avon at Christchurch (Ha) On the other hand, Lawman confuses the *Auren* (*Avren*), derived from Wace (see below), with the East Avon (W, Ha), which does in fact empty into the sea at Christchurch (Ha). But the name *Avren*, as taken from Wace by Lawman and repeated (2498AB, 2560A), is obviously a slight distortion (loss of *H-*) of the Welsh form of the river *Severn* (Welsh *Hafren*) How then did the confusion arise?

Geoffrey of Monmouth<sup>4</sup> (pp 256-7), treating the same incident, says that Gwendoline fought Locrine 'iuxta fluuium *Sturam*' and 'rubet enim Estrildam & filiam eius *Habren* in fluuiio precipitari qui nunc *Sabrina*<sup>5</sup> dicitur' Here is the first (and accurate) picture of the event By the *Stura* (*Stou*), Geoffrey meant the river of that name<sup>6</sup> which rises near Halesowen (St) and joins the *Severn* (Welsh *Hafren*) at Stourport (Wo), and Geoffrey makes quite clear that the Welsh *Hafren* (*Habren*) is the Latin *Sabrina* or the river known in modern English as the *Severn*.<sup>7</sup>

It is to Wace,<sup>8</sup> then, that we must turn for an explanation of the difference in geography between Geoffrey and Lawman *Stour* is the name of several English rivers, and Wace, when he tells us (1462) that Gwendoline and Locrine fought

Sor l'ève qui a nom *Esture*,

in his ignorance of English geography gratuitously adds (1463)

S'entrecontrèrent en *Torsète*

<sup>3</sup> Eilert Ekwall, *English River Names* (Oxford, 1928), pp 379-82, cited as *ERN*

<sup>4</sup> Acton Griscom ed, *The Historia Regum Britanniae of Geoffrey of Monmouth* London Longmans Green and Co, 1929

<sup>5</sup> Milton's *Comus*, 823 ff, preserves the legend into the 17th century

<sup>6</sup> Eilert Ekwall, *ERN*, p 380

<sup>7</sup> Eilert Ekwall, *ERN*, pp 358-60, on the modern English vocalism *Severn* vs OE *Sæfern*, see F P Magoun, "Territorial, Place-, and River-Names in the Old-English Chronicle, A-Text (Parker MS)," *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, XVIII (1935), p 93

<sup>8</sup> Le Roux de Lincy ed, *Le Roman de Brut par Wace*, 2 vols, Rouen, 1836. Only Vol I of Ivor Arnold's ed (1938) has appeared

and thus identifies Geoffrey's *Stura* (*Stour*) with the Dorsetshire Stour. Then, apparently knowing no Welsh and little English geography, Wace confuses Geoffrey's *Habren* (Welsh *Hafren*) with Avon<sup>9</sup> (Welsh *Afon*), the name of several English rivers, and identifies it with the East Avon (W, Ha). Proof of this is seen when Wace tells us, according to the British Museum *MS Cotton Vitellius, A X* fol 28<sup>v</sup> 10

Puis fut l'ewe u ele fut jete  
 Del nom *Abren Aven* apelee  
*Avren*, ke de *Abren* son nom prent  
 A *Crste-cherche* en mer descent

It is Wace's additions of *Torsète* (Dorset) and *Crste-cherche* (Christchurch, Ha), which shift the whole scene of the narrative from Stourport in Worcestershire to Christchurch in Hampshire and confuse the location of both rivers and the very name of one of them. The fact that Lawman tells us (5-9) that he himself lived at '*Ernleie* uppen *Seuarne* (stape) on fest *Radestone*,' which is Ayley Kings (Wo),<sup>11</sup> a suburb of Stourport (Wo) at the confluence of the Stour and Severn, makes his carelessness in

<sup>9</sup> Le Roux de Lincy's text (1475 8) runs thus

Puis fust l'ève où ele fut getee  
 Del nom *Abren Avren* nomeé  
*Avene* qui d'*Abren* son nom prent  
 A *Cirecestre* en mer descent

The editor, after identifying *Avene* (1477) as well as *Abren* and *Avren* with Severn (Montg, Sa, Wo, Gl, Monm, So), proceeds to identify *Cicestre*, properly enough, as Cirencester (*Cicester*) (Gl), but makes no comment on the difficulty, presented by line 1478, of the Severn entering the sea at an inland town in Gloucestershire. This absurdity is noted by Madden (III, 313-4, n to p 106), who falls, however, into the same error as did Lawman himself and, on the basis of the reference to Christchurch (Ha), confuses the Severn with the East Avon (W, Ha). Madden's concluding remarks in this note (p 314) that 'the mistake appears to have arisen from confounding the Hampshire Avon with the river of the same name in Warwickshire, into which a second Stour flows, and which flows into the Severn at Tewksbury (Gl),' merely makes confusion worse confounded, since the Avon and Stour thus referred to have no possible connection with the events under discussion.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted by Madden, III, 313, n to p 106. This is essentially Arnold's reading (II 1437-40).

<sup>11</sup> F. T. S. Houghton, *The Place Names of Worcestershire* (English Place Name Society, IV, Cambridge, 1927), p 29.

mechanically following Wace and repeating the latter's errors, all the more difficult to understand. It suffices to say that the rivers in question are, or rather should be, the Stour (St, Wo) and the Severn (Montg, Sa, Wo, Gl, Monm, So) *not* the Stour (W, Do, Ha) and the East Avon (W, Ha).

### 2 *Desse*

Lawman tells us (29907-14) that Baldric, earl of Cornwall, held '*Deuene-scire*' (Devon) as far as '*þæt watre Desse* wendeð into þare sae'. The river is the Exe (So, D).<sup>12</sup> Wace tells us (14371-5) that

Bledic de Cornuaille ert sire  
Et si tenoit de Lienesire  
Ensi comme *l'eve d'Esse* cort  
Des la fontaine où ele sort  
Dusqu'en la mer où el dessent

With the discrepancy between Lawman's '*Deuene-scire*' (Devon) and Wace's '*Lienesire*' (Leicestershire) we need not concern ourselves here. All students of Lawman should be grateful to Max Forster for his happy perception ("Ablaut," p. 76, n. 2) of the identity of Wace's '*l'eve d'Esse*' and Lawman's '*þæt watre Desse*' with the river Exe (So, D).

### 3 *Darwent*

Lawman tells us (14688 ff.) how the British leader Vortimer marched out of London to give battle to Hengest and Hors(a) who were at 'Epiford'<sup>13</sup> uppen þan watere þe men nemneð *Darwent* (14693B) *Darewente*' (14693A). Put to flight, Hengest and his followers fled 'in to Kent' (14718). The flight continued till the Saxons saw 'an heore riht hond' (14734) an island 'þat is i-hote Tanate' (Thanet) (14736). As Madden (see note 13) points out, Lawman here has confused the first two of four conflicts between the Britons and Saxons. Treating the same incident, Wace tells us (7255 ff.) that there were four battles in all. Of these, he says (7271-3):

<sup>12</sup> Max Forster, "Ablaut in Flussnamen," *Streitberg Festgabe* (Leipzig, 1924), pp. 71-85, cited as "Ablaut." Eilert Ekwall, "Ablaut in Flussnamen," *Anglia Beiblatt*, xxxvi (1925), 277-80, idem, *ERN*, pp. 153-6.

<sup>13</sup> As yet not satisfactorily identified. See Madden, III, 355, n. to p. 189.

De desor l'ève de Dergent<sup>14</sup>  
 Se combatent premièrement,  
 Desos Epifor, à un gue

Geoffrey (p 373) also speaks of four battles 'Piumum super fluunum *Derewend*,<sup>15</sup> secundum super uadum Epiffordum'<sup>16</sup> All these details help to identify the river as the Darent (K)<sup>17</sup> which rises near Westerham and flows (20 m) to the Thames below Erith. Of interest here is the preservation of the *w* in Lawman's forms, in the light of Ekwall's observations (*ERN*, pp 114-5) that all the genuine English forms of the name fail to preserve the *w*. Since Ekwall does not include Lawman's forms—though he does that of Geoffrey—what we have here is either a late sporadic preservation of the *w* in purely English forms of the name or the preservation of the *w* due to the influence of Geoffrey.

#### 4 *Wale-broc*.

Lawman tells us (10728 ff) how Livi<sup>us</sup> Gallus, the Roman commander in London, was attacked by the British under Asclepi<sup>d</sup>iot. The British overwhelmed the Roman garrison who took refuge in 'þan castle' (10767). The Romans asked for mercy, promising to leave Britain if spared. Asclepi<sup>d</sup>iot agreed, but the Scottish king Columban, who was marching to help Asclepi<sup>d</sup>iot, met the Romans outside the walls of London and, refusing to abide by Asclepi<sup>d</sup>iot's truce, massacred them. The dead Romans were thrown 'in to þan broke' (10831) which, 'for Gallus wes isla<sup>z</sup>en þer bi' (10838) 'a þere Ænglisce boc he is i<sup>h</sup>atē *Wale-broc* (10841A) *Welebroc*' (10841B). Wace (5630 ff) tells the same story, saying (5682-5)

L'ève où Gallus ca<sup>i</sup> et jut  
 Del nom *Galli* son nom re<sup>ç</sup>ut,  
*Nengualh*<sup>18</sup> l'apèlent Breton  
*Galabroc*, Englois et Saiscon

<sup>14</sup> Le Roux De Lincy in a footnote glosses *Dergent* as *Derwent* (1 e *Derwent*) which, he says, is the name of four English rivers and a lake. The rivers he locates, correctly, in Cu, Db, Du, and Y respectively. His identification of *Epifor* (*Epiford*) corresponds to that made by Madden (n 13 above).

<sup>15</sup> Variant readings *Derwent*, *derWent*.

<sup>16</sup> Variant reading *Epifford*.

<sup>17</sup> Eilert Ekwall, *ERN*, pp 113-5.

<sup>18</sup> Variant readings *Hengualm*, *Nengallh*. Le Roux De Lincy in a footnote correctly locates the river in London.



Geoffrey (pp 334-6) also tells the same story, saying (p 336) that, 'postea de nomine ducis, Britannice *Nantgallum*<sup>19</sup> Saxonice uero *Galabroc*<sup>20</sup> nuncupatus fuit' The river is the Walbrook,<sup>21</sup> a stream which ran through what is now Finsbury Circus, down the street which goes by the name of 'London's Wall,' past All Hallows Church and the Bank of England, across Cannon Street and over the site of the Cannon St railway station to the Thames, just north of Southwark Bridge The name<sup>22</sup> means 'the stream of the foreigners' *Nen-*, *Nant-*, in Wace and Geoffrey respectively, reflect Welsh *nant*, pl *nentydd*, 'brook'

Cambridge, Mass

ROLAND BLENNER-HASSETT

### A NOTE ON *CHEST*

Although the *NED* gives under the anatomical meaning of *chest* an example as early as 1530, the figurative use of the word according to which the chest is "regarded as the seat of the emotions and passions," is illustrated by no instance before 1590 *Chest* was, however, used in its figurative sense at least as early as the first recorded literal use I quote from *The Beauty and Good Properties of Women* [*otherwise Calisto and Melibaea*], c. 1530

For I fele sharp nedyls withyn my brest  
Peas warr truth haterad and iniury  
Hope and suspect and all in one chest<sup>1</sup>

Baltimore, Maryland

LEWIS C RICHARDSON

<sup>19</sup> Variant readings *Nantgallum*, *Nantigallum*

<sup>20</sup> Variant reading *Gallabroc*

<sup>21</sup> Geoffrey, intro, pp 211-6, Madden, III, 343, n to p 27, Eilert Ekwall, *ERN*, p 430, J E B Gover, *The Place Names of Middlesex*, London, Longmans Green and Co, 1922, p 90, R E Zachrisson, "Romans, Kelts and Saxons in Ancient Britain," *Kunghga Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet*, Uppsala, xxiv (1927), p 73, cited as *RKS*

<sup>22</sup> On the proper name *Wealh*, 'Briton, slave, foreigner,' see Mats Redin, 'Studies on Uncompounded Names in Old English,' *Universitets Arsskrift*, Uppsala, 1919, p 8, and on the place name containing *Wealh*, sb 'a Briton,' see J E B Gover, *The Place Names of Devon* (English Place Name Society, VIII, 2 pts), pt 1, p 16, for several Devonshire *Walla Brooks*, Zachrisson, *RKS*, pp 40-6 and 67-8, J H Murray ed, *A New English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1888-1933, under "Welsh", Redin (above), pp 8 and 26

<sup>1</sup> The Tudor Facsimile Text, ed John S Farmer (London and Edinburgh, 1909), sig Auv.

## THREE TEXTUAL NOTES ON FOURTEENTH-CENTURY POETRY

1 One of the most important passages in *Piers Plowman* is Passus vi, ll 1-104 of the C-text. The poet is justifying the life which he lived in London, and he bases his justification on a clear and simple theory of society—a theory conservative rather than revolutionary. Each man, he says, should know his station and do the duties proper to it, so that an effective reform may be brought about within the frame-work of existing institutions. Unfortunately, a false punctuation by the editors has obscured the meaning of the text at a critical point. Lines 65-69 are given thus by Skeat:

Bondmen and bastardes and beggers childien,  
 Thuse by longeþ to labour and lordes [kyn to] seruen  
 Bothe god and good men as here degree askeþ,  
 Some to synge masses oþer sitten and wryte,  
 Rede and receyue þat reson ouhte spende,

Obscurity arises in the second line (l. 66), where Skeat's punctuation does not show whether *lordes kyn* is subject or object. Should beggars' children serve the kin of lords, or should the kin of lords serve both God and good men according to their degree? More recent editors have not solved the difficulty. Kenneth Sisam, for example, in his *Fourteenth Century Verse and Prose*, rejects Skeat's reading in l. 66, *kyn to*, which Skeat took from MSS Cotton, Vesp. B. xvi and Camb. Univ. Lib. Ff. 5. 35, and substitutes *children sholde*, the reading of MS. Phillipps 8231. He then punctuates the passage thus:

Bondmen and bastardes and beggers children,  
 Thuse bylongeþ to labour, and lordes children sholde seruen,  
 Bothe God and good men, as here degree askeþ,  
 Some to synge masses, oþer sitten and wryte,  
 Rede and receyue þat Reson ouhte spende,

Sisam's interpretation, though it may not be correct, is clear enough, he has given a definite answer to a question which even the scribes had evidently found puzzling. In his opinion, *lordes children* is the object of *seruen*, and his version of the text may be translated: "Bondmen and bastards and beggars' children belong to labour, and should serve lords' children, both God and good

men, according to their degree—some of these humble people to sing masses, others to sit and write, to read and to receive what is reasonable for them to spend”

Many other scholars, including A. H. Bright in his *New Light on 'Piers Plowman,'* have accepted such an interpretation, which, however, contradicts the spirit of the entire passage and opposes the direct statements made in ll 54, 61-64, and 70-81. There the poet declares that clerks, the legitimate children of franklins and freemen, should do clerical works, common men the ruder tasks, and he complains that such distinctions have been lost. This declaration of rights and duties is flatly contradicted by Sisam's reading, but a few changes in punctuation make the whole passage perfectly consistent

Bondmen and bastards and beggers children,  
 Thuse bylongeþ to labour, and lordes children sholde seruen  
 Bothe God and good men, as here degree askeþ—  
 Some to synge masses, oþer sitten and wryte,  
 Rede and receyue þat Reson ouhte spende,

The sense is now much clearer. “Bondmen and bastards and beggars' children belong to labour, and lords' children should serve both God and good men, according to their degree—some to sing masses, others to sit and write, to read and to receive what is reasonable for them to spend”

Internal evidence should be sufficient to justify this reading, but there is also an important bit of external evidence. According to Jusserand, the Commons in 1391 passed an act ordaining that the children of bondmen and villeins should not be educated as clerks. The C-text was quite possibly written after the passage of this act, and, all things considered, it is more likely that the poet should uphold the law than that he should condemn it. Little doubt, therefore, can remain that the proposed interpretation is correct. Its significance, especially for theories of the poet's birth, should be obvious. Langland was chiefly occupied in ecclesiastical singing and in writing, and he stoutly affirms that he was living the good life. At the same time he declares that bastards have no place in any such occupations, which are reserved for more reputable persons, and he speaks without shame of the father and friends who had sent him to school. He could not have placed more emphasis on his legitimacy.

2 The meaning of *rewarde* in l 604 of *Pearl* has been much debated. In the Kingdom of God, the poet says, every man is paid alike, "Wheþer lyttel oþer much be hys rewarde", and scholars have been divided whether to read "reward" or "regard, consideration". The *New English Dictionary* cites contemporary parallels for both meanings, so that external evidence is of no assistance, but the question can be answered by a study of the poem itself. For the reading "regard, consideration," there is the following evidence: (a) The poet tells the Parable of the Vineyard, which was often used to prove the heretical doctrine of the equality of heavenly rewards. (b) Line 603 states definitely that all men are rewarded *alike* in Paradise. "For þer is vch mon payed in-lyche". These reasons are not convincing. Several more telling facts may be adduced which indicate that the true interpretation is "reward". (a) It is plain that the poet, though he used the Parable of the Vineyard, did not believe in equality of rewards. Lines 577-580 are a definite statement that the reward of the innocent Pearl is greater than the reward of any merely righteous man.

More haf I of ioie & blysse hereinne,  
Of ladyschyp gret & lyueþ blom,  
þen alle þe wyȝez in þe worlde myȝt wyne  
By þe way of ryȝt to aske dome

The inequality of the innocent and the righteous is here stated, and other inequalities in Heaven are elsewhere suggested. Various ranks exist—the aldermen right before God's chair (ll 885-887), the saints who sit around the throne (l 835), several orders of angels (ll 1121, 1126), and doubtless more. (b) Line 603 states not that rewards are *identical*, but that they are *alike*, while l 606 definitely indicates that rewards are unequal. *Queþersoener he dele nesch oþer harde*.

The reading "reward," therefore, is certainly as probable as the reading "regard". The poet possibly held that all the blessed are rewarded alike, since they are all in the presence of God, but that they are not rewarded equally, since they differ in their spiritual capacity to realize His presence. Either reading would fit such an interpretation, and a final decision is impossible, but the recent statement of eminent authorities, that "reward" makes nonsense of the passage, can definitely be rejected.

3 Lines 647-648 in Book XVII of Barbour's *Bruce*, according to MS G. 23 in St. John's College (Camb), read thus

Thair fais, that feill thai left lyand,  
Sum ded, sum hurt, and sum swavnand

The only other MS of the *Bruce*, that in the Advocate's Library in Edinburgh, was copied in 1489 by the same John Ramsay who had copied the Cambridge MS two years before, but the Edinburgh MS reads not *swavnand*, but *swonand*. The form *swonand*, "swooning," raises no difficulty, but *swavnand*, the harder reading, has never been satisfactorily explained. Conjectural emendations, such as Tolkien's *swalmand* or *swemand*, carry no conviction, and Tolkien himself declares that the word is "not a possible Scottish form of Swone."

The problem may possibly be solved by a simple emendation to *swavrand*, from *swaver*, a Northern dialectal form meaning "to stagger, totter," which appears, as early as 1400, in the *Morte Arthure*, l. 3970. The greatest objection to this emendation is that the sense of the verb must be extended from "staggering" to "writhing."

JAMES SLEDD

University of Texas

### THE SEQUENCE OF SCENES IN *HAMLET*

There is a striking difference between the arrangement of scenes in the bad text (Quarto 1) and the good text (Quarto 2, Folio) of *Hamlet*. Sir Edmund Chambers has put the matter succinctly. The difference

concerns the order of tests by which the court endeavors to ascertain the reason of Hamlet's strangeness. There are three, in interviews with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (the Schoolfellow scene), with Polonius (the Fishmonger scene), with Ophelia (the Nunnery scene). The sequence in Q2 and F is as follows. The King plans the Schoolfellow test (II, ii, 1-39). Polonius plans the Ophelia test (II, ii, 85-167). Hamlet appears reading, and Polonius improvises his own test (II, ii, 168-223). The Schoolfellow test is carried out (II, ii, 324-634). The failure of the Schoolfellow test is reported (III, i, 1-28). Finally the Ophelia test is tried (III, i, 28-196). In Q1 on the other hand, the Ophelia test is put much earlier, and immediately follows its planning.<sup>1</sup>

In other words, in Q1 the large passage of the "To be or not to be" soliloquy followed by the Nunnery scene and Claudius' "Love, his

<sup>1</sup> *William Shakespeare, A Study of Facts and Problems*, I, 416-7

affections do not that way tend" is not found at III, 1, 56-170 as in Q2 but after II, 11, 160-67 where Polonius suggests to Claudius that at some time in the future they arrange a meeting between Ophelia and Hamlet and watch behind the arras to determine whether the latter had been made mad by his love for her.

Professor Schucking in *The Meaning of Hamlet* has recently argued that the arrangement of scenes in Q1 is superior to that in Q2-F. "It is obvious that the sequence of the action here is incomparably more logical than in the Second Quarto" <sup>2</sup> Because of this opinion and because of the shortness of the maimed text, he concludes that Shakespeare revised and amplified the version upon which Q1 is based in order to create Q2. "In so doing, he altered the order of scenes not very happily and inserted the soliloquy, 'To be or not to be' in a less suitable place."<sup>3</sup>

It seems evident that Professor Schucking has arrived at his conclusions without a study of recent scholarship on the texts. The most important book yet written on the relation of the bad text to the good is Giovanni Ramello's *The Tragical Histories of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke 1603*, Studi sugli Apocrifi Shakespeareani, Torino, 1930. Signor Ramello shows conclusively, in the present writer's opinion, that Q1 is based wholly on the Q2-F version and that it is a memorial reconstruction with all differences being definitely assignable on the one hand to mnemonic confusion and on the other to the creative ability of the reporter. Although Sir Edmund Chambers does write of the reporter, "But he evidently fought shy of reconstructing imperfectly recollected long speeches, and left them incoherent," <sup>4</sup> he does not commit himself definitely to the memorial reconstruction hypothesis. Substantially, however, his conclusions and Ramello's are the same. More recently, A. S. Cairncross in *The Problem of Hamlet—A solution* has given an admirable analysis, in the manner of Dr. Greg's study of *Orlando Furioso*, in *Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements*, of how the reporter's memory operated <sup>5</sup>

Now "the incomparably more logical" sequence is not as "obvious" to others, as it is to Herr Schucking. "Why the change

<sup>2</sup> *The Meaning of Hamlet* (London, 1937), p. 181.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 184.

<sup>4</sup> *William Shakespeare*, I, 416.

<sup>5</sup> *The Problem of Hamlet—A Solution* (London, 1936), pp. 40-44.

should have been made is not so clear," writes Sir Edmund "It abridges the interval between the planning and execution of the Ophelia test but lengthens the interval before the Schoolfellow test" <sup>6</sup> Ramello has shown how the different position of the Nunnery scene in Q1 gives rise to many improbabilities and inconsistencies which are not present in the arrangement of Q2.<sup>7</sup> He points out, particularly, that in Q1 Polonius still believes Hamlet to be mad because of love for Ophelia (see lines 929-31 and 1010-1012), even *after* the latter's harsh and gross treatment of the girl in the Nunnery scene. He adds that no such improbability exists in Q2.

Is there any acceptable explanation for the different sequence in Q1? There is. Dr. Greg has stated that his study of the bad quarto of *Merry Wives of Windsor* (which, he was the first to point out, is a memorial reconstruction) had led him "to doubt whether any limit can be set to the possible perversion which a text may suffer at the hands of a reporter" <sup>8</sup> Cairncross, writing of Tate Wilkinson's memorial piracy of Sheridan's *Duenna*, has some cogent things to say about sequence of scenes in memorial reconstructions.

Wilkinson kept the regulation of the scenes with magazines. But without their assistance, he could as easily have confused their order, as he has confused the order of single words. Especially where there is no relation of cause and effect between the incidents in successive scenes, where for example, they are supposed to happen simultaneously, the memory is very liable to confuse the order. Try, as an experiment of this kind, to write down from memory these scenes from *Macbeth*, in their correct order. The murder of Lady Macduff, Macbeth's second visit to the Witches, the sleep walking scene, and the dialogue between Lennox and a Lord about Macbeth's crimes <sup>9</sup>

From my study of the bad quartos, I would like to add somewhat to the above statement. Especially where there is a relation of cause and effect between incidents that are not successive in the original but are separated by unrelated incidents, the memory is very likely to confuse the order and put the cause incident and the effect incident together. Furthermore, as analysis of memorial re-

<sup>6</sup> *William Shakespeare*, I, 417

<sup>7</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 59-64

<sup>8</sup> *MLR*, v (1910), 197, quoted by Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, I, 419

<sup>9</sup> *The Problem of Hamlet*, pp. 39-40

constructions reveals, if two passages are similar in meaning, the reporter is quite likely to transpose them, or put the first where the second should be and omit the second, or merge both into one passage

Let us now try to see whether a case can be made out for the hypothesis that the change in sequence of scenes in Q1 from that of Q2 was due to mnemonic confusion on the part of the reporter. Let us first examine Q2. At the end of II, 1, Polonius, having decided (from what Ophelia has just told him) that Hamlet's love for her has made the latter mad, asks his daughter (II, 1, 101 and 117) to go with him to the king to whom this important discovery must be revealed. However, when Polonius enters in the next scene to do this, Ophelia is not with him. Sir Edmund speaks of this inconsistency, as "characteristic enough of Shakespeare." In Q1, however, Ophelia does enter with Polonius. I suggest that the reporter unconsciously rectified Shakespeare's inconsistency. Now let us compare two parts of Q2: the lines where Polonius plans the Ophelia test (II, 1, 160-170) and the lines just before the Ophelia test (III, 1, 28-56). In the first, Polonius states that, at some time in the future when Hamlet is walking in the lobby, he will "loose my daughter to him", he and the King will be watching behind the arras to determine whether it is love that has made Hamlet mad. Then the Queen sees Hamlet coming. Polonius asks the King and Queen to leave. Hamlet enters. In III, 1, the King states that he has sent for Hamlet "hither. That he as twere by accident, may here Affront Ophelia", he and Polonius will be hidden and watching to determine whether it is love that has made Hamlet mad. Polonius hears Hamlet coming. He asks the King to withdraw with him. Hamlet enters.

Let us now put our memorial reconstruction hypothesis to work. Given the cause and effect relationship, given the similarity of meaning and event in the above two passages, is it any wonder that the reporter's memory betrayed him, so that he merged the two passages and put what comes after the second immediately after the telescoped scene? (It must be remembered that the reporter could do this because in Q1—but not in Q2—Ophelia is present during the planning of the test). Q2 has in II, 11

*Quee* But looke where sadly the poore wretch comes reading

*Pol* Away, I doe beseech you both away, *Exit King and Queene*



In III, 1 we find

*King* Sweet Gertrard, leave us two,  
*Queen* I shall obey you  
*Pol* Ophelia walke you heere, gracious so please you,  
 We will bestow ourselves, reade on this booke,

*Enter Hamlet*

*Pol* I heare him comming, with draw my Lord

The reporter's memory merged these two together to form

*King* See where hee comes poring vppon a booke

*Enter Hamlet*

*Cor* Madame, will it please your grace / To leave vs here?  
*Que* With all my heart *exit*  
*Cor* And here Ofelia reade you on this booke, / And walke aloofe,  
 the King shal be vnseene

How the reporter's mind worked is well revealed by study of the first line of this quotation from Q1. "But looke where sadly the poore wretch comes reading" of II, 11 and "I heare him coming" of III, 1 being similar in meaning were clapped together by the reporter's recollection. The resultant line in Q1 consists of the line of II, 11 contaminated by "reade on this booke" of III, 1. And it is given neither to the Queen, who warns of Hamlet's arrival in II, 11, nor to Polonius, who warns of his arrival in III, 1, but to the King! Furthermore the merging of the two lines forces the reporter to put what should come *before* Hamlet's entrance, Polonius' directions to Ophelia and the clearing of the stage, after Hamlet's entrance! The King's request to the Queen of III, 1 is given to Polonius in Q1 undoubtedly because of the latter's request to the King and Queen to withdraw in II, 11. As has been said above, because of the combination of the two passages, that which follows the second (the "To be or not to be soliloquy" and the Nunnery scene) is wrenched out of its rightful order and put first in a sequence in which it should be last. But the reporter supplies a link of five un-Shakespearean lines between the Nunnery and the Fishmonger scenes.

Professor Schucking praises Q1's arrangement of the soliloquy

Unlike the other soliloquies, this one shows [in Q2] no signs of belonging to the particular scene in which it appears. On the contrary, Hamlet, by ordering the performance of the play, has just taken the first step toward the accomplishment of his revenge. He might, therefore, be expected to

be in a state of tension, wondering whether the mine he has laid will explode. Such being the case, it seems unlikely that he would give himself up to far-reaching reflections on the subject of life and death. For this reason, it has often been pointed out that, in the first Quarto, the soliloquy appears in a much more suitable position in the text, that is, in the second scene of the second act, immediately after Polonius has unfolded his plan to the King of playing the eavesdropper with him. Hamlet then appears, absorbed in a book, and pondering on what he finds in it. Traces of the original arrangement are visible here. Hamlet, who proceeds to comment on what he reads, is deep in Plato, proof of which is afforded by Montaigne, who, acting as Shakespeare's intermediary, quotes from Plato's *Apology*, in which Socrates philosophizes on the nature of death. These speculations agree strikingly, both in content and phraseology, with Hamlet's train of thought, which is, in fact, an examination of Plato's ideas.<sup>10</sup>

In Q2 in II, 1 Hamlet appears reading a book. Polonius asks him, "What do you read, my lord?" (II, 1, 192.) And Hamlet proceeds to talk about the libel against old men written by "the satirical rogue." In III, 1, *Hamlet does not appear reading a book*. There is not a shred of evidence in the authentic version that he is reading a book before the "To be or not to be" soliloquy. If my textual analysis of Q1 above be correct, Herr Schucking is simply unaware that his interpretation of Hamlet conning Plato and commenting on him rests on Q1's employing the Queen's warning line of II, 1, and following it with the soliloquy of III, 1. As for Herr Schucking's belief that the soliloquy is not appropriate to Hamlet in III, 1, it may be pointed out that although they give us a necessary view of the protagonist's character, the "To be or not to be" lines are essentially undramatic in their position in both Q2 and Q1. If it be argued that Hamlet should be tense, after planning the play experiment, and, hence, cannot properly speak the soliloquy, it may also be argued that in its position in Q1, the soliloquy represents the first lines by Hamlet after the Ghost scene—shouldn't he be very tense? I think it sometimes better to keep our over-subtle sense of psychological truth away from the theatre.<sup>11</sup>

Baltimore, Maryland

LEO KIRSCHBAUM

<sup>10</sup> *The Meaning of Hamlet*, pp 115-6

<sup>11</sup> E. E. Stoll has also recently defended the superior sequence of scenes in Q1. "Hamlet and the Spanish Tragedy, Quartos 1 and 2: A Protest," *MP*, xxxv (1937), 34-9. The learned author argues ably and well—but he misses the textual evidence of mnemonic confusion completely.

## POETIC ALLITERATION

Mr. B F Skinner's article on "Alliteration in Shakespeare's Sonnets" in the *Psychological Record*, Oct 1939, is, as I understand it, an example of science in criticism misapplied "In spite of the seeming richness of alliteration in the sonnets . . . so far as this aspect of poetry is concerned Shakespeare might as well have drawn his words out of a hat." At this conclusion he arrives by way of a process of tabulation and of calculation—tabulation for what Shakespeare did and calculation for what chance or a non-alliterative poet would have done—applied to 100 sonnets, or 1400 lines. The line is, for him, the unit, alliteration that extends beyond it being ignored. In four columns he lists the totals for 22 different consonants so far as they begin the syllables of "major words"—first the number of lines not containing the consonant in question, then those containing one, then two, then three, then four—totals accompanied in each case by the results which the frequency of the consonant warranted him, according to the doctrine of chances, in expecting. For the table I must refer the reader to the article.

The psychologist is right in recognizing the role of chance or accident. Anybody may alliterate; some writers, with an alliterative turn, have to hold their pens in check. But of the value of Mr. Skinner's table I am not quite convinced in the first place, and I am more than dubious about his use of it in the second. Artistic alliteration, as in the passage quoted below, often extends beyond the single line, often is to be found within the syllable instead of at the beginning, and may involve the repetition of kindred consonants—labials, dentals, or liquids—instead of the same. Here the statistics are inadequate. And it is an effect to a good ear immediately perceptible. Here the statistics are out of place. Poetry, like other arts, deals with appearances, as poets like Wordsworth have declared; and in saying "in spite of the seeming richness" the writer gives his case away. There is no mistaking artistic alliteration for the sort which comes about in any person's speaking or writing, by chance or (as we have seen) through idiosyncrasy. The same is to be said of the natural and normal psychological tendency, in any person's speaking or writing, of which Mr. Skinner here and elsewhere makes much, for a sound to recur. That is a matter of "suggestion." What is not fortuitous is functional, in this scheme. But artistic alliteration is not the unintended and scarcely avoidable

concomitant or by-product of the thought Neither is it, on the other hand, so separate or detachable as Mr Skinner makes it Assonance, the interweaving of the vowels, is as important as that of the consonants Alliteration and assonance, rime and rhythm—the melody and the harmony, in short,—together with the phrasing, the figures, the vocabulary, depend on the content, not for their origin, but for their imaginative and emotional effect, as the content in turn depends for the same sort of effect upon them This sort of music is little or nothing without the sense, but the sense itself is incomplete or crippled without the music

Not that the Summer is less pleasant now  
Than *when* her <sup>1</sup> mournful hymns did hush the night,  
But that *wild* music burdens every bough  
And sweets grown common lose their *dear* delight —Sonnet cu

Not from out of a hat but a head came such words, such music, and out of no common brainpan, either The alliteration and assonance together are nothing particularly ingenious, there is possibly a poet or so now living who might pen lines that as mere sound would be as agreeable, and as mere thought more considerable, but none, I dare say, who could attain to the perfect felicity of these, together with the rhythm and the phrasing, in an interrelated whole To that the alliteration is indispensable, and art is here, as everywhere, not the creature of association nor a prey to chance or caprice

This alliteration is not obtrusive, to some ears, perhaps, not quite perceptible, and it is not imitative, onomatopoetic. That, in the present article and elsewhere, is the only sort accepted by the psychologist as intentional and (it would seem) artistic. That, by literary critics, is considered a much lower form of the art The sound of the verse should be no more than a faint echo of the sound described. But in the onomatopoetic the intention is obvious, unmistakable, and that is what science, which has not a delicate ear, requires

My chief objection, however, is that the table, once drawn up, does not warrant the conclusions *A priori* what should we expect if Shakespeare did make an artful use of alliteration, like a true Elizabethan, like all good poets, moreover, ancient or modern? For the purpose of giving prominence in certain individual lines to a particular consonant at the beginning of the syllable he must

<sup>1</sup> The nightingale's

necessarily, either in the single sonnet or (as in the table) in sonnet after sonnet, reduce the consonant's prominence in the other lines. That is, Shakespeare might be expected to have more lines in which the consonant does not thus occur (0), and also fewer lines with only one occurrence (1), on the one hand, and more lines with two, three, or four occurrences, on the other hand, than the doctrine of chances would allow for. And that is just what the table shows. For *n*, that is to say under (0), 1190 Shakespeare, 1176 calculated, (1) 182 Shak, 208 calc, (2) 27 Shak, 15 calc, (3) 1 Shak, 0 calc. For *b* under (0) 1038, Shak, 1020 calc, (1) 299 Shak, 332 calc, (2) 60 Shak, 44 calc, (3) 2<sup>2</sup> Shak, 3 calc, (4) 1 Shak, 0 calc. This holds good for almost every consonant in the table, the two noticeable exceptions being *th* and *s*. Shakespeare has 52 lines in which two syllables begin with *th*, whereas Mr. Skinner expected 57, 161 in which they begin with *s*, whereas Mr. Skinner expected 162. Why these exceptions? The reason is apparent and only proves the artistic purpose which Mr. Skinner so stoutly denies. Deliberately or instinctively Shakespeare was avoiding or subduing the hisping and hissing quality too prominent in the English tongue. Instinctively, in all likelihood, for the alliterative practice of a great poet, though appropriate and artistic, not accidental as Mr. Skinner thinks, is, by the time he reaches mastery, a second nature to him—incidental, one might say. But only then Shakespeare cultivated and practised the art at the outset, and this is proved by the greater prominence and comparative inexpertness of the alliteration in his earlier work.

Error, which in criticism doth so easily beset us, is, when in the guise of science and armed with statistics, particularly insidious and dangerous. It seems to, but does not, put other error to flight. It is therefore in special need of detection. In what Mr. Skinner undertook to do I have not tested his accuracy. The tabulations and calculations I have not verified. If what I have said above is to the point that labor would be to little purpose. But the reader needs to be assured that the tabulations and calculations have been on a strictly phonetic basis. The further investigations of the subject, which are said to be under way, would profit by greater explicitness on this head.

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

*University of Minnesota*

---

<sup>2</sup> Repetition of the word

CHURCHYARD'S DESCRIPTION OF THE QUEEN'S  
ENTERTAINMENT AT WOODSTOCK IN 1592

Sir E K Chambers, in his admirable study of *Sir Henry Lee* (Oxford, 1936), argues that the entertainment provided by Lee for the Queen in 1592 was probably written by Richard Edes of Christ Church, Oxford.<sup>1</sup> He refutes Mr R W Bond's argument that the entertainment was written by John Lyly and presented at Quarrendon, one of Lee's estates.<sup>2</sup> Sir E K Chambers' authority is Sir John Harington, who quotes two pieces from the entertainment as by Richard Edes, and names the place as Woodstock, where Lee was keeper of the Royal Lodge, and where the court lay from 18 to 23 September. This is sufficient authority for the author and place of the entertainment, since Mr Bond has no direct evidence to offer in support of his contentions. But there is further evidence on both points which ought not to be overlooked.

Thomas Churchyard published *A Handeful of Gladsome Verses, given to the Queenes Maiesty at Woodstocke this Prograce, 1592*,<sup>3</sup> in which he describes the entertainment and bears witness that the author was an university man. He begins by saying that he wishes to present some poesies to the Queen, but his style is too plain

For learned sages wies, / That much haue seene and red  
Who knowes the course of stars in skies, / And what may well be sed  
  
And all the liberall artes, / Have at their fingers ends  
They for their giftes and speciall partes, / Which God to scholers sendes  
  
Are worthie hearing still, / They bring the sugred cuppe,  
They are the nurses of good skill, / That fosters children vppe  
  
They with the muses talke / As all things were their owne  
And like the Gods doe closely walke / In secret clouds vnknown

This is intelligible as a reference to the fact that the author of the entertainment was very learned and a university man. Richard Edes was long of Christ Church, Oxford, where he was granted a Doctorate in Divinity in 1590

<sup>1</sup> Pp 145, 149 Chambers, pp 276-97, prints the best text of the entertainment

<sup>2</sup> *The Complete Works of John Lyly* (Oxford, 1902), I, 404, 453, 526

<sup>3</sup> Printed "At Oxforde by Ioseph Barnes, Printer to the Vniuersitie, 1592", reprinted by Henry Huth, *Fugitive Tracts Written in Verse*, First Series (1875), no 31

Churchyard goes on to lament the changing fashion which is driving poets to change their trade or starve. It sounds as though Churchyard was disappointed about his share in the preparation of the entertainment. His complaint supports the observation made by Dr E. C. Wilson that the work of literary artists [as distinguished from rhymsters like Churchyard] appears to dominate in the memorials of the Queen's progresses after 1590.<sup>4</sup>

The next few stanzas allude directly to the content of the entertainment, which represented Sir Henry Lee as having been put to sleep by the fairy queen for being unfaithful to his charge. He is awakened by the Queen. The entertainment was continued on the second day, and Lee was represented as dying. He sends a letter to the Queen, and also a poetic will. Finally he is revived by her favor. Churchyard says

In verse great vertue is, / If wolke well passe the file  
And verse gets grace, with that or this, / To make the Prince to smile  
Then many knacks we proue, / Our credite well to keepe  
And tell how Lords for Ladies loue, / Will lie all day a sleepe  
And faine when they awake, / In verse or letters long  
That they doe die for mistresse sake, / And suffer too much wrong  
A large discourse thereof, / Twere good to tell in deede  
But some would say I iest and scoffe, / And speake more wordes then neede

He could tell stories about witches and fairies, and here he mentions several superstitions about the house fairies.<sup>5</sup> But only the truth is worthy of the Queen. The intention of this passage is not clear. It may be a reference to the entertainment (with fairies) which Churchyard prepared for the progress of 1578,<sup>6</sup> or he may have been glancing slightly at the use made of the fairy queen by his learned rival, the fairies being more properly a subject for vulgar and popular writers like Churchyard himself. His references

<sup>4</sup> *England's Eliza* (*Harvard Studies in English*, xv, 1939), p. 61.

<sup>5</sup> Sir E. K. Chambers, in his edition of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* (The Warwick Shakespeare, n. d.), App. A, pp. 163-4, quotes the passage. Miss M. W. Latham, *The Elizabethan Fairies* (New York, 1930), p. 268, lists the work in her "Authorities and Texts Consulted," but she gives the date wrongly as 1578 and cites Chambers' quotation rather than the original or the Huth reprint.

<sup>6</sup> J. Nichols, *The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1823), II, 179-213; C. R. Baskerville, "The Genesis of Spenser's Queen of Faerie," *MP*, xviii (1920-21), 49-54.

indicate that he was thinking of current folklore and not of the literary fairy lore which was just developing

Both Churchyard and Sir John Harington assign the 1592 entertainment to Woodstock Churchyard indicates that the house was repaired for the occasion

Old Woodstocke house is glad / It shall haue stone and lime  
That long with Iuy hath ben clad / To shew the ruen of time

We know that the court was at Woodstock from 18 to 23 September, but Sir E. K. Chambers thinks that during the visit the Queen spent a night at Lee's estate at Ditchley, four miles away, and that the entertainment was performed at Ditchley. He advances as evidence an eighteenth century local legend that the Queen once spent the night at Ditchley, and the statement, in the 1592 entertainment, that the entertainment at Woodstock in 1575 took place "not far from here." This phrase is quite ambiguous. It may refer to another corner of the same park, or it may be merely an example of litotes. Therefore it should be mentioned, in support of Chambers' theory, that the part of the 1592 entertainment printed in *The Phoenix Nest* (1593) is headed "An excellent Dialogue betweene Constance and Inconstancie, as it was by speech presented to hir Maiestie, in the last Progresse at sir Henrie Leighes house."<sup>7</sup> It seems less probable that the royal lodge at Woodstock, where Lee was keeper, would be called "Sir Henrie Leighes house," than that an entertainment presented during the course of a royal visit to Woodstock should be erroneously described as presented "at Woodstock."

JOSEPHINE WATERS BENNETT

*Evanston, Illinois*

---

## COLLEY AND CAIUS CIBBER

At the Public Record Office and Somerset House, I happened not long ago on two or three facts which supplement Richard Hindry Barker's *Mr. Cibber of Drury Lane*. Mr. Barker gives an admirably thorough account of five of Cibber's children, but one of them,

<sup>7</sup> Quoted from the edition by H. E. Rollins (1931), p. 16. Chambers quotes the title of this piece in a footnote on p. 285, but he does not mention it in connection with his argument as to the place of the entertainment, on p. 149, although he probably had it in mind.



James, he fails to mention, perhaps because he was unable to find the bills and answers for the Chancery suit of 1714 between Colley and his wife<sup>1</sup>

Little can be said about James, but that little is interesting to the student of Cibber. James was blind.<sup>2</sup> Immediately one thinks of "The Blind Boy," a poem, for Cibber at least, astonishingly subtle and understanding. A good poet may write a good poem out of a completely imagined experience, but a mediocre poet needs often the stimulation of an immediate joy or sorrow. That Cibber had constantly before him a child who suffered the bewildered solitude of the blind explains the fact that the laureate of cheap hyperbole and genial chatter sounded for once a note of honest and intimate pathos.

The Chancery documents which help to account for the minor miracle of "The Blind Boy" possess some further importance. Answers of Lewin and John Shore testify not only to Cibber's prosperity in 1714 but also to the fact that he was at the time providing adequately for his family. Lewin states that he believes Cibber "hath a Considerable Incombe from his businesse sufficient to enable him to provide for the said Complainants and that he provides for each of them accordingly." And Shore states that "he knows not what reall Estate Colly Cibber . . . hath but is informed and beleives that he hath a Considerable Incombe from his business sufficient to enable him to provide for the said Complainants and that he provides for each of them accordingly."<sup>3</sup> Indeed, all these additional Chancery documents indicate that Cibber was at least not seriously indifferent to the needs of his children. Even Mrs. Cibber, the complainant, stresses merely his neglect of Elizabeth—and she provides a reason for that. Cibber,

<sup>1</sup> (New York), 1939, pp. 18-19. The complaint of Mrs. Cibber and her children, among whom James is listed, is C6/391/7. The answers of Elizabeth Jones, servant to William and Rose Shore, of Daniel Lewin, one of the executors of Mrs. Shore's will, and of John Shore, her brother, are likewise to be found under C6/391/7, the answers of Cibber himself and Richard Farwell, the other executor of Mrs. Shore's will, under C6/392/12.

<sup>2</sup> Rose Shore, sister-in-law of Mrs. Cibber, describes him as "a blind child" in granting him in 1713 a provisional bequest of £50 (P. C. C. 195 Leeds). She does not specifically state that he was the child of Colley and Katherine, but I see no reason to doubt that he was the James Cibber whom Mrs. Cibber names as one of her two sons in the Chancery bill.

<sup>3</sup> C6/391/7.

she says, "looking upon [Elizabeth] to be Sufficiently provided for (and far better than his other Children) by the Legacy Bequeathed unto her as aforesaid doth absolutely refuse to allow her Sufficient Maintenance and Educacōn at his own Expense he having so great a Charge of Children to provide for" <sup>4</sup> The proper inference from these bills and answers may even be that the suit represents no more than an attempt on the part of the Cibbers to secure the help of the Court in straightening out two tangled legacies In any case, this new evidence indicates pretty clearly that there was no grave quarrel over the estates between Cibber and his wife and that Cibber, for a time at least, adequately financed his family

By way of supplement to another book about the Cibbers, Harald Faber's *Caius Gabriel Cibber*, I might also call attention to material in the Public Record Office which documents Faber's guess that "in the eighties . . . Cibber travelled about in the country and worked at several places for various noblemen" <sup>5</sup> In 1682, Cibber was working on monuments at Bottesford to George, the seventh Earl of Rutland, John, the eighth Earl, and John's wife, Frances <sup>6</sup> In the same year he was "imployed by the Lady Cambden to be her Sculptor and to doe worke for her in the way of his Trade att her house att Exton neare Stamford in the County of Rutland." <sup>7</sup> Lady Cambden commissioned Cibber to make a statue of her son James, who had died in 1681 at the age of eighteen Three years later, in 1684, James Wright, in his *History and Antiquities of the County of Rutland*, described the statue as "a Neat Monument, lately erected in the North side of the Church," according it the honor of a full-page reproduction and quoting the Latin and English inscriptions. <sup>8</sup> When next heard from, in 1686, Cibber was working for Evelyn, first Duke of Kingston, at Thoresby Hall <sup>9</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* The legacy referred to is Mrs Shore's bequest to Elizabeth See Barker, p 18

<sup>5</sup> (Oxford, 1926), p 48

<sup>6</sup> *Historical MSS Commission, MSS of the Duke of Rutland*, II (1889), 67, W Samuel Weatherley, "Tombs and Monuments," *Memorials of Old Leicestershire*, ed Alice Dryden (1911), p 241, John B Firth, *Highways and Byways in Leicestershire* (1926), p 373

<sup>7</sup> C6/277/24, Cibber vs Crosen and Sumpster

<sup>8</sup> Pages 60-61 I have not found any definite attribution of the statue to Cibber Since, however, it was made between 1682 and 1684, just when Cibber was working for Lady Cambden, it may safely be regarded as his.

<sup>9</sup> C6/277/24, Faber, p 48

The Chancery suit which thus supplements Faber's account discloses several minor Cibberian misfortunes bound up with a bill presented to Cibber by one Robert Crosen, an innkeeper of Stamford. Incidentally it reveals one further fact of some slight importance. Among the miscellaneous items that make up Cibber's debt, Crosen lists a loan of fourteen shillings to "Gabriell Cibber son of the Comp<sup>ty</sup>"<sup>10</sup> Since Colley, the first child of Carus's second marriage, was born November 6, 1671, and since the loan was made about 1682, Gabriel must have been Colley's half-brother by Carus's former marriage. Heretofore our list of Carus's children has included only Veronica, Lewis, and Colley.

FRED S. TUPPER

*The George Washington University*

---

### THE GENTLEMAN-CULLY

Professor Nicoll lists *The Gentleman-Cully*, an anonymous<sup>1</sup> play, among the comedies of intrigue, and comments briefly on it. "Without wit, and without the least infusion of sentimental motives, it carries on in a fairly unoriginal manner the old elements of this style"<sup>2</sup> In the main, his appraisal of the play is just; but he fails to consider an interesting feature, namely, its spirit of reaction against the hero-rake of Restoration comedy, which is exemplified especially in the heroine's attitude toward her dissolute suitor.

*The Gentleman-Cully* was produced in 1701, during a period when the old comedy had run its course, and the new had not yet emerged. In the nineties of the previous century the reaction against the license and immorality of Restoration comedy had already begun. Collier's *Short View* was not a voice crying in the wilderness, but an expression of public opinion. It is common knowledge, however, that despite the pronounced opposition to Restoration

<sup>10</sup> C6/277/24

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Coxeter attributed this piece to Charles Johnson, and it is invariably included among the latter's plays. After a thorough examination of *The Gentleman-Cully* I have come to the conclusion that Coxeter's attribution is unfounded.

<sup>2</sup> Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama*, p. 169

license, the comedy of manners more than held its own in the early eighteenth-century theatre. The comic muse of this period supposedly dominated by middle-class morality, draws heavily upon the dramatists who were anathema to such reformers as Collier and Bedford.<sup>3</sup> The plays of Etherege, Wycherley, Congreve, and Vanbrugh, often somewhat expurgated, remained staples in the repertoires, and their eighteenth-century imitators were legion, though the latter, to be sure, sought to fetch the bourgeois element of their audience by converting the scapegraces of their comedies before the final curtain. The uninterrupted popularity of the comedy of manners explains in part the comparatively late flowering of the full-blown sentimental play. It was not until 1722 that Steele brought out *The Conscious Lovers* and gave the stage a hero who was morally poles asunder from the typical protagonist of Restoration comedy. The appearance of Bevil, however, was not the signal for the immediate banishment of the slightly reformed Dorimant, in play after play the hero persisted in being "lewd above four acts," submitting ultimately to the exigency of a required reformation. Throughout the first half of the eighteenth century dramatists not only refrained from attacking the libertines of the old comedy but constantly favored and copied them.

It is in view of the foregoing that *The Gentleman-Cully* deserves some attention, for the piece deals in the main with the discomfiture of a pair of roués, Faithless and Townlove. The latter, who is the gentleman-cully of the title, comes to London in order "to dash his University Learning with a little Town-breeding." Townlove is gulled and bled white by the bawds and whores. His crony, Faithless, casts a covetous eye upon the fortune of a marriageable heiress, Sophia, but he loses his chance of winning her when she discovers that he has debauched her maid. Sophia also rejects the suits of Flash, a lineal descendant of Sir Fopling Flutter, and of Ruffle, a *miles gloriosus*. At the final curtain, the heiress and her confidante, Aurelia, make plans to remain forever wedded to the single state.

The plot-content of the comedy is extremely anaemic; it consists of a series of ineptly developed scenes in which the *dramatis*

<sup>3</sup> Arthur Bedford, *Serious Remonstrances in Behalf of the Christian Religion Against the Horrid Blasphemies and Impieties which are still used in the English Playhouses*, London, 1719.

*personae* "make" conversation. In reality, the piece has neither hero nor heroine. The two libertines, Townlove and Faithless, are thwarted and discomfited, the coxcombs, Flash and Ruffle, are soundly thrashed and laughed out of court. Sophia is a shadowy, sleazy figure, of whom we know nothing except that she is wealthy. She speaks the language of a Restoration-comedy belle when discoursing of the male sex and matrimony, but often contradicts her expressed views soon after they are voiced. Early in the play, for example, she categorically denies that virtue is to be found among men, while affirming that "an honest Virtue is seated in *Faithless Face*."

The interesting feature of this piece is the adverse treatment of the two rakes. Unlike his friend, Townlove is not even permitted to enjoy a partial success, all his amorous adventures prove disastrous. The rake's affinity with his Restoration prototype is made clear by one of his soliloquies. While waiting for one of his whores, Townlove takes up a volume of Rochester's poems, and then comments in this vein: "This *Rochester* charms me, what he writes pleases. All his Smut diverts those who can't taste his Wit, and his Wit even those who won't relish his Smut—I took him up to waste the tedious Time till this Girl comes, and he hath put my Blood into such a Ferment, all my Patience is destroy'd."<sup>4</sup>

Faithless especially is closely modelled on Dorimant, both are admittedly fortune-hunters first and lovers second. But whereas Dorimant finally obtains his lady and her estate, Faithless gets neither Sophia nor her money. In Etherege's play, Harriet, a typical Restoration heroine, knows full well that the man she has consented to marry is a confirmed rake-hell, but her cynicism comes to the rescue. She does not expect much of marriage or of her husband. Speaking of Dorimant, she says: "I think I might be brought to endure him, and that is all a reasonable woman should expect in a Husband."<sup>5</sup> Unfortunately for Faithless, Sophia's demands are considerably greater. Here, for example, is her idea of a true lover and husband:

He that values a Woman's Virtue above her Person, and her Person above every one's else, pleas'd only with her Presence, and sad only in her

<sup>4</sup> *The Gentleman-Cully*, Quarto 1702, III, 11 (p. 25)

<sup>5</sup> *The Man of Mode*, III, 1. George Etherege, *Works*, ed. Brett-Smith, II,

Absence This Man whose Life, Fortune, and Pretensions to the rest of Womankind shou'd be forgotten and sacrific'd for her sake, rich only in the Possession of her and thinks Poverty and Misery exist only in the Loss of her \*

tially, Sophia is seeking a kind of husband typified by Bevil, teelee's high-minded and meticulously honorable hero was still two decades away And when it transpires that Faithless is a profligate, she not only rejects his suit but also threatens to make him marry the girl he has seduced Censor, her uncle, a rough-spoken critic of the vices and follies of the age, applauds her action. "Well, thou art a brave spirited Wench," he comments, "and hast done exemplary Justice to thy self, in punishing a Faithless Villain" †

The classification of this anonymous comedy is, in my opinion, not so simple as Professor Nicoll would have it, for although the element of intrigue is present in the play, it is by no means of paramount importance. The piece does not belong to that type of drama which Professor Nicoll aptly terms the "moral-immoral" play The dramatist does not adopt the *modus operandi* of Colley Cibber, the last curtain finds Townlove and Faithless still unreformed. Aside from the playwright's implied opposition to libertinism as such, there are no features of sentimentalism in the comedy, nor is the influence of Farquhar ‡ discernible. It is a nondescript piece, interesting only in its rather unusual treatment of the hero-rake I have yet to read a piece of this period in which the libertines receive such short shrift as do Faithless and Townlove.

M. MAURICE SHUDOFKY

Baltimore, Maryland

---

\* *The Gentleman Cully*, II, 1 (p 9)

† *Ibid.*, V, 1 (p 48)

‡ It should be remembered that *The Beau's Stratagem* was not produced until 1707, six years after *The Gentleman-Cully* The sentimental hues of Farquhar's comedies prior to that are rather pale

## REVIEWS

- Holmes of the Breakfast-table* By M A DeWOLFE HOWE  
[London and] New York Oxford University Press, 1939  
Pp x + 172 \$2 50 *American Fiction 1774-1850 A Contribution toward a Bibliography* By LYLE H WRIGHT. San Marino, California Huntington Library Publications, 1939.  
Pp xviii + 246 \$3 50 *Six New Letters of Thomas Paine*  
Edited with an introduction and notes by HARRY H CLARK.  
Madison The University of Wisconsin Press, 1939 Pp.  
xxxii + 63 \$2 50

Mr Howe's biographical essay on Oliver Wendell Holmes is one of the most pleasing products of recent American scholarship. Comprehensive without attempting to be exhaustive, it epitomizes the account of Holmes's career as given in the official biography by John T. Morse, Jr., adds new materials drawn from published reminiscences, manuscripts, and oral tradition, and directs judicious attention toward both the contemporary and the surviving literary appeal of Holmes's work. Biographer and subject are well met, for Mr. Howe knows nineteenth century Boston very much as the breakfast-table philosopher himself knew it and so is able to place Holmes in his environment with a nicety and apparent ease which is rare in American biography. He treats Holmes as a human being in a human environment, not as a literary "figure" who must be re-interpreted and pigeon-holed for convenient reference, and the result is that while he avoids the excess of reverence found in Morse's biography he does not fall into the labored, stiff objectivity of so many academic biographers nor into the superficial generalizations of the more popular school. Yet his book is illuminating, suggestive, and witty, and it will be as valuable to the student as it is entertaining to the general reader of Holmes.

The subtitle of Mr. Wright's book is an accurate but modest description of the work. A census limited to the American fiction in seventeen libraries and two private collections, it is nevertheless the most comprehensive list of its sort that is available. It contains, for example, more titles than the revised (1929) edition of Wegelin's *Early American Fiction* for the period 1774-1830 and, in all, lists nearly 1400 titles. An appendix catalogues over a hundred volumes that Mr. Wright saw mentioned but did not find in the libraries examined. The alphabetical arrangement (by author and, for anonymous volumes, by title) is more convenient than Wegelin's, and the cross references and title index make the work easy to use. The bibliographical information is not complete, but it is altogether adequate for the ordinary student who will find the census parti-

cularly valuable in locating the titles that attract his interest Mr Wright has also made an interesting and useful summary of the historical significance of his labors in "A Statistical Survey of American Fiction, 1774-1850," published in the *Huntington Library Quarterly*, II, 309-318 (April, 1939)

Professor Clark has put into book form the letters addressed by Thomas Paine to the citizens of Rhode Island in defense of the proposed national tariff which aroused widespread discussion in 1782-1783 They have hitherto been available only in newspaper files, and hence this volume supplements Moncure D Conway's standard edition of the *Writings of Thomas Paine* Professor Clark's introduction is both informative and confusing—informative because it places the letters properly in the discussion of which they formed a part, and confusing because of the author's excessive devotion to such idols of the academic theatre as the terms "radical" and "conservative" The latter term may be useful in a discussion of the support given to certain national institutions after the Constitution was established, but its application to the advocates of these institutions when they were still untried innovations shows a sacrifice of historical perception to the love of classification which approaches obscurantism In this particular case it would have been news had the advocate of national unity during the American Revolution reversed his position when the war came to a close But since he did not do so, these letters are of considerably less interest and "significance" than Professor Clark's introduction would have us believe them to be

LEON HOWARD

*Northwestern University*

*Mélanges de linguistique romane offerts à M Jean Haust* Liège  
1939. Pp 440

Ce volume présenté au maître de la linguistique wallonne, l'auteur des *Étymologies wallonnes et françaises* et du *Dictionnaire liégeois*, à l'occasion de son admission à l'éméritat, réunit trente études qu'ont contribué des savants belges, hollandais, français, suisses et allemands et qui portent particulièrement sur le champ de travail de M. Haust Je me contente, sans vouloir par là faire du tort aux autres auteurs, de signaler certaines études pouvant intéresser tous les romanisants M P Barbier prouve que *barbouquet* ne vient pas de *bis- + bouche*, mais de *barbe (de) bouc* et suggère l'explication de *barbiche*, non pas par *barbe + -iche*, mais par *barbe (de) biche*, M Dupire propose, à la lumière d'alternances picardes, de considérer le développement *linge* et *ligne*, *rongerogner* comme des variantes du développement de *n + yod* en *fr* ; M Duraffour atteste un déplacement d'accent qu'il avait noté dans les patois franco-provençaux, son domaine particulier, dans une



large aire de la France septentrionale *de grossès gouttes* en wallon, *des bellés filles* en picard etc., une idée géniale est celle de M. Jud, de rattacher l'ital *refe* 'fil' à un \**rife* extrait de *rifidus* 'fil retors' (attesté en valaisan, cf lat *trifidus* > ital. *trefole*) d'après *lucidus-luce*,<sup>1</sup> M. L. Michel atteste *salgaud* chez Jean d'Outremeuse au XIV<sup>e</sup> s. comme nom d'un païen et établit le climat psychique d'un tel nom sans se prononcer définitivement sur l'étymologie, M. Valkhoff traite de l'"individualité et interdépendance des dialectes français," en reprenant la question amorcée par Mlle G. Wacker, M. M. Piron oppose la "formation littéraire de la langue littéraire des écrivains liégeois" à la tentative similaire de Mistral il ne s'agit point pour le liégeois littéraire du XIX<sup>e</sup> s. d'une "koinè" Qu'il me soit permis de relever le renouveau littéraire qu'a connu le suffixe désuet *-ance* dans cette littérature patoisante *d(i)sseulance* 'isolement, solitude' (cf *esseulé*), *keûlance* 'tranquillité, apaisement,' de *keû* 'coi', *rouvance* de *roûvi* 'oublier' C'est le milieu psychique de l'écriture symboliste *souvenance*, *remembrance*, *assouvissance*, tandis que l'acception burlesque (*putance* > *croustance*, *bectance*) n'apparaît pas J'ajoute à mes remarques dans *Le fr mod* VII, 276 seq. la déformation d'un nom propre de soldat de la grande guerre chez J. Romans, "Prélude à Verdun" p. 102 "ce cher idiot Norestier dit Norestance" chante, nous dit l'auteur, "quand on apporte le repas, et par hommage sans doute à son propre appétit qui est grand

*Norestance*      *tance tance tance tance*  
*La croustance*      "

Il est curieux de voir un "vulgare illustre" liégeois s'annoblier en choisissant la "nuance noble" d'un suffixe ambivalent de la langue française

LEO SPITZER

### BRIEF MENTION

*Tales and Songs of Southern Illinois*, collected by CHARLES NEELY, edited with a Foreword by J. W. SPARGO Menasha, Wis. Banta, 1938. Pp. xxii, 270 \$2.50 After Mr. Neely's untimely death, Professor Spargo with characteristic generosity undertook the duty of editing this collection of tales and songs current in that part of Illinois familiarly known as Egypt. The volume gives us a rich and varied lot, of interest to all folklorists and lovers of popular literature

K. M.

<sup>1</sup> Ce qui me fait particulièrement plaisir dans cette découverte, c'est qu'un des prétendus témoins les plus vénérables de ce 'filon' osco ombrien sollicité dans le temps par Ascoli, se révèle aujourd'hui être un romanisme assez récent. Cf. les cas de *farfecchie* (Schuchardt, *ZRP*, xxxiv, 527), de *taffiare* (*Arch. rom.*, VII, 159) et de *ad ufo* (*Bulletti de dial. cat.*, x, 85)

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Arnold—Poetry and prose, with William Watson's poem and essays by Lionel Johnson and H W Garrod With an introduction and notes by E K Chambers *Oxford Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press]*, 1939 Pp xxxvi + 187 \$125

Bowers, F T—Elizabethan revenge tragedy *Princeton Princeton U Press*, 1940 Pp x + 288 \$3 00

Chambers, R W—Man's unconquerable mind, studies of English writers, from Bede to A E Housman and W P Ker *London Cape*, 1939 Pp 414 15 sh

Davis, Rose Mary—The good Lord Lyttelton, a study in eighteenth century politics and culture *Bethlehem, Pennsylvania Times Publishing Co*, 1939 Pp xii + 443 (Columbia diss)

Ehason, Norman E and Davis, Roland C—The effect of stress upon quantity in dissyllables, an experimental and historical study *Bloomington, Indiana Ind U*, 1939 Pp 56 \$1 00 (Ind U Pubs, Science Series, 8)

Kirby, Thomas A—Chaucer's *Troilus*, a study in courtly love *University, Louisiana La State U Press*, 1940 Pp xii + 337 \$3 00 (La State U Studies, 39)

Logan, Sister Eugenia (ed)—A concordance to the poetry of Samuel Taylor Coleridge *Saint Mary-of-the-Words, Indiana* privately printed, 1940 Pp xvi + 901

Metcalf, John C—De Quincey a portrait *Cambridge, Mass Harvard U Press*, 1940 Pp x + 210 \$2 00

Oxford book of English verse—Chosen by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch (New edition) *Oxford Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U. Press]*, 1939 Pp xxviii + 1172 \$3 00

Reade, Charles—It's never too late to mend An edition of the unpublished drama with an introduction and notes by Léone Rives *Toulouse Imprimerie Toulousaine (Lion and Fils)*, 1940 Pp 111 [Privately printed]

Reynolds, George F—The staging of Elizabethan plays, at the Red Bull Theater, 1605-1625 *New York Mod Lang Assoc of America*, 1940 Pp x + 203 \$2 00 [Mod Lang Assoc of America, General Series, ix]

Rives, Léone—Charles Reade, sa vie, ses romans *Toulouse. Imprimerie Toulousaine*, 1940 Pp 525.

Weber, Carl J—Hardy of Wessex, his life and literary career *New York Columbia U Press*, 1940 Pp xii + 302 \$3 00

Wells, Henry W—A chronological list of extant plays produced in or about London, 1581-1642 (Supplement to his *Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights*) *New York Columbia U Press*, 1940 Pp 17

Young, G M—The age of Tennyson, Waiston lecture on English poetry, British Academy 1939 *London Humphrey Milford [N Y Oxford U Press]*, 1939 Pp 20 \$0 60

## GERMAN

Appelt, E P, und Hanhardt, A M—Deutsches Leben, ein volkswissenschaftliches Lesebuch *New York Harper [1940]* xiv, 184 pp \$1 20

Grootaers, L—Mededelingen van de Zuidnederlandsche Dialectcentrale 1939 Nrs 3-4 *Leuven Zuidnederlandsche Dialectcentrale*, 1939 Pp 129-188

—De Nederlandsche Dialectstudie in 1938 [Handelingen van de Koninklijke Commissie voor Typonomie & Dialectologie XIII, 1939] Pp 385-412

Pusey, W W—Louis Sébastien Mercier in Germany His Vogue and Influence in the Eighteenth Century [Columbia Univ Germanic Studies, No 8] *New York Columbia Univ Press*, 1939 243 pp \$2 50

Stegemeier, Henri—The Dance of Death in folksong, with an introduction on the history of the Dance of Death *Diss Chicago*. 1939 231 pp

Thorp, Mary.—The Study of the Nibelungenlied Being the History of the Study of the Epic and Legend from 1755 to 1937 [Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature] *New York Oxford Univ Press*, 1940 vi, 196 pp \$4 25

Trubners Deutsches Wörterbuch Im Auftrag der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für deutsche Wortforschung hrsg von Alfred Gotze 20.-23. Lieferung Ich—Kaulquappe, C—durchgefallen *Berlin de Gruyter & Co*, 1939 Vol IV, pp 1-112, Vol II, pp 1-112 4° M 4

## FRENCH

Abry, Crouzet, Bernès, Léger—Les Grands écrivains de France illustrés II *Paris: Didier*, 1939 1235 pp Fr 84

Alberse, J D—Chemical Fr Reader *Boston Heath*, 1940 vi + 114 pp \$0 48

Alden, D. W.—Marcel Proust and his French critics *Los Angeles Lymanhouse*, 1940 viii + 259 pp

Anseïs de Mes, according to M S Bibl de l' Arsenal 3143, ed H J Green *Columbia diss Paris* 1939 458 pp

Balzac—Ferragus, ed W S Hastings and

J Wenger *Boston* Heath, 1940 xiv + 176 pp \$1 00

Barney, W S — A Practical Fr Review Grammar *New York* Prentice Hall, 1940 208 pp \$1 60

Bézar, Yvonne — Le Président de Brosses et ses amis de Genève *Paris* Boivin (1940) 255 pp (Et de litt étr et comp, 12)

Biencourt, M I — The French Preposition *Los Angeles* The Scholastic Press (1939) 198 pp

Chamard, H — Hist de la Pléiade 2 v *Paris* Didier, 1939 xii + 381 + i + 403 pp Fr 140

Charpentier, John — A de Musset *Paris* Tallandier, 1938 287 pp Fr 18

Clerc, Moser, Bianconi, Pignet — Panorama des littératures contemporaines en Suisse *Paris* Eds du Sagittaire, 1938 204 pp Fr 20

Corneille — Le Cid, présenté par R Caillols *Paris* Hachette, 1939 120 pp Fr 6 50

Gantner, P — Das literarische Portrat in Frankreich im 17 Jhr *Heidelberg* diss, 1939 133 pp

Girart de Rossillon, poème bourguignon du XIV<sup>e</sup>s, ed E B Ham *New Haven* Yale U Press, 1939 (pub March 5, 1940) 457 pp \$3 00

Guillemin, Henri — Lamartine, l'homme et l'œuvre *Paris* Boivin, 1940 167 pp

Guyer, F E — A Short Fr Grammar for College Students *New York*. Harper, 1940 xviii + 189 pp \$1 20

Haedens, Kléber — Gérard de Nerval ou la Sagesse romantique *Paris* Grasset, 1939 163 pp Fr 15

Halévy — L'Abbé Constantin, ed B E Buckford and Algernon Coleman *Boston* Heath, 1940 viii + 181 pp \$1 00

Hoffmann, Hilde — Zur Bedeutungsverzweigung des Wortes \*domnicella im Gallo romanischen *Zurich* diss, 1939 155 pp

Hubert-Fillay — Balzac au collège de Vendôme, 1807-13 *Blois* Eds du Jardin de la Fr, 1939 32 pp

Hugo, V — Notre-Dame de Paris, ed L H Skinner *New York* Prentice-Hall, 1940 324 pp \$1 00

Irvin, L P and King, D. L — Lectures intermédiaires *New York* Harper (1940) xii + 529 pp \$1 80

Jones, Kathleen — La Revue britannique, son histoire, son action littéraire (1825 40) *Paris*. Droz, 1939 i + 207 pp Fr 24

König, Karl — Ueberseische Wörter im Französischen *Halle*. Niemeyer, 1939 249 pp

Kuhlmann, Hel — Die Armut als lebensgefährdende u. lebensformende Kraft im Werke L Bloys *Münster* diss, 1939 125 pp

La Bruyère — Les Caractères, présentés par Guy Michaud *Paris* Hachette, 1939 124 pp Fr 6 50

La Salle, Bertrand de — A de Vigny *Paris* Fayard, 1939 424 pp Fr 20

Levaux, Léopold — Les Masques de Baudelaire *Paris* Magné, 1938 63 pp Fr 10

Liou Kin-ling — Etude sur l'art de V Hugo dans "La Fin de Satan" *Paris*: Presses mod., 1939 119 pp

Ludmann, H — Individuum u Gemeinschaft in den Romanen Maupassants *Münster* diss, 1939 111 pp

Marguerite — Heptaméron, ed Luckenwald *Lubeck* Antaus-Verlag, 1939 389 pp

Maschinot, G — Glossaire de la Chanson des Quatre fils Aymon *Paris* Rev mod des arts et de la vie, 1939 ii + 179 pp

Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Ch Bally *Geneva* George, 1939 xii + 515 pp

Molinet, Jean — Faictz et dictz, éd Noel Dupire, III *Paris* Soc des anc t fr, 1939 316 pp

Oresme, Maître Nicole — Le Livre de Ethiques d'Aristote, ed D Menut *New York* Stechert, 1940 547 pp \$6 00

Payen, F — Le Barreau et la langue fr *Paris* Grasset, 1939 303 pp Fr 25

Pitray, Arlette de — Sophie Rostoptchine, comtesse de Ségur, racontée par sa petite-fille *Paris* Michel, 1939 192 pp Fr 18

Raphael, Pierre — Introd à la corresp de M Proust *Paris*. Eds du Sagittaire, 1939 176 pp Fr 20

Sihn, C I — Benserade and his *Ballets de cour* *Baltimore* Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 435 pp (J H Studies in Romance L and L, ex vol XV) \$4 00

Thomas, Jean — Isabelle, trag imitée de l'Arnoste, éd Al Cioranescu *Paris* Droz, 1938 161 pp Fr 25

Three Old Fr. Chronicles of the Crusades, trans by E N Stone *Seattle*. U of Washington, 1939 viii + 377 pp

Villiers, A — La vie privée d'A de Musset *Paris* Hachette, 1939 256 pp Fr 18

## ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante — La Divina Commedia Tomo I Inferno Testo curato da F Flora *Milano* Hoepli, 1939 221 pp L 200

Annali Manzoniiani A cura del Centro di Studi Manzoniiani Vol I *Firenze*. Sansoni, 1939 323 pp L 50

Apollonio, M — Storia del Teatro italiano Vol II Il Teatro del Rinascimento Commedia, Tragedia, Melodramma *Firenze*: Sansoni, 1939 450 pp con 20 tavv., leg. L 50

Butelli, G — Giuseppe Parini *Torino*: Paravia, 1939 123 pp L 5

Bertoni, Giulio — Il Duecento 3a edizione riveduta ed aumentata *Milano* F Vallardi, 1939 xii + 422 pp L 60

Capuana, Luigi — Le più belle novelle, scelte e presentate da Lucio d'Ambra *Palermo* Sandron, 1939 40 pp

— Novelle A cura di Giuseppe Sciortino 4a ediz *Palermo* Sandron, 1939 222 pp L 8

Caterina (s) da Siena — Le lettere, ridotte a miglior lezione e in ordine nuovo disposte, con note di N Tommaseo A cura di P Misciatelli Vols I, II, III *Firenze* "Mazzocco," 1939 Pp xxxiv + 277, 316, 319 L 15 cad

Cian, V — La satira Dall'Ariosto al Chiabiera *Milano* F Vallardi, 1939 v + 546 pp Leg L 65

Clemente, M — L'Arcadia in Parini *Messina* Principato, 1939 viii + 168 pp L 10

Cozzani, E — Pascoli Vol IV *Milano* "l'Eroica," 1939 334 pp L 10

Croce, B — La poesia di Dante 4a ediz riveduta *Bari* Laterza, 1940 216 pp L 20

De Sanctis, Francesco — Storia della letteratura italiana A cura di G Lazzeri Prima edizione illustrata con 2000 incisioni e 500 tav Accresciuta di notizie, ecc Vol I *Milano* Hoepli, 1940 xiv + 624 pp L 125

— Storia della letteratura italiana, a cura di B Croce Nuova ediz riveduta da A Parente *Bari* Laterza, 1940 2 vols 436, 472 pp L 60

Fava, D — Manuale degli incunaboli *Milano* Mondadori, 1939 287 pp L 18

Festa, N — Umanesimo 2a edizione riveduta *Milano* Hoepli, 1939 xi + 205 pp con 27 tavv L 12

Fioretti di San Francesco, riveduti nel testo e commentati da Mario Casella *Firenze* Sansoni, 1939 xvi + 143 pp L 7

Foscolo, U — Poesie Con introd e commento di G Natali *Bologna* Cappelli, 1939 xxxvii + 170 pp L 8 50

— I sepolcri Pref e commento di I Testa *Firenze* La Nuova Italia, 1939 62 pp L 3 50

Gentile, G — Giuseppe Pitre *Firenze* Sansoni, 1939. 34 pp L 4

Gozzi, G — Opere scelte, a cura di E Falqui. *Milano* Rizzoli, 1939 1030 pp con 12 illustr (Classici Rizzoli) leg L 50

Grasso, D — Nuova critica leopardiana *Palermo* Libreria Agate, 1939 xxiv + 272 pp L 20

Kahane, Heinrich u Renée. — Italienische Ortsnamen in Griechenland *Athen* "Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbucher," 1940 xxviii + 379 pp

Machiavelli, N — Scritti militari, tratti dal *Principe*, dai *Discorsi* e dalle *Lettere* A cura di G Beizero *Firenze* Le Monnier, 1939 xix + 134 pp L 11

Medici, De', Giuliano — Poesie, a cura e con studio di Giuseppe Fatini *Firenze* Vallecchi, 1939 cxxx + 144 pp L 30

Parenti, M — Bibliografia Dannunziana *Firenze* Sansoni, 1939 66 pp L 8

Pflaum, H — L' "Acerba" di Cecco d'Ascoli Saggio d'interpretazione *Firenze* Olschki, 1939 69 pp

Pirandello, L — Saggi A cura di M Lo Vecchio Musti *Milano* Mondadori, 1940 475 pp L 8

Manzoni, A — Poesie di Alessandro Manzoni prima della conversione, con note critiche di A Chiari *Firenze* Le Monnier, 1939 iv + 320 pp L 22

Profeta, O — De Roberto e Pirandello Note Catania Studio ed mod, 1939 95 pp L 7

Razzoli, G — Nei regni di San Giorgio Storia letteraria del sentimento cavalleresco in Italia *Roma* Ist Grafico Tiberino, 1939. xvi + 422 pp L 25

Rumor, M — Giuseppe Giacosa Saggio *Padova* C D E M, 1940 iv + 121 pp L 30

Silber, Gordon R — The Influence of Dante and Petrarch on Certain of Boccaccio's Lyrics *Menasha, Wis* George Banta Publishing Co, 1940 vii + 162 pp

Singleton, Charles S — Nuovi Canti carnascialeschi del Rinascimento Con un'appendice Tavola generale dei Canti carnascialeschi editi ed inediti (Istituto di Filologia Romanza della R Università di Roma Studi e testi) *Modena* Società tipografica modenese, 1940 174 pp L 50

Viola, R — Fogazzaro *Firenze* Sansoni, 1939 231 pp L 15

Wartburg, Walter von. — La posizione della lingua italiana nel mondo neolatino *Firenze* Sansoni, 1939 100 pp L 8

## SPANISH AND PORTUGUESE

Alemania y el mundo ibero-americano. — Alemanha e o mundo ib-am *Berlin* Ibero am Inst, 1939 185 pp

Alonso, A — El artículo y el diminutivo *Santiago de Chile* Univ de Chile, 1937 63 pp

Baroja, Pio — La Vida de un estudiante en Madrid, ed E Brenes and D H Patterson *New York* Harper (1940) xii + 130 pp \$1 00

Berenguer Carisomo, A — El teatro de Carlos Arniches *Buenos Aires*, 1937 114 pp \$2 00 arg

Bleca Tejeiro, J M. y J M Alda-Tesán —

Introd al estudio de la lit esp II *Zaragoza* 1937 255 pp

Botelho de Amiral, V — Dicionário de dificuldades da língua portuguesa *Porto* Edit Ed Nacional, 1938 xvi + 321 pp

Camoens, Luis de — The *Lusiad*, trans Richard Fanshawe (1655), ed J D M Ford *Cambridge* Harvard U Press, 1940 xxii + 307 pp \$3 50

Cantarell Dart, J — Defendamos nuestro hermoso idioma *Buenos Aires* Menéndez, 1937 208 pp \$2 00 aig

Carroll and Scanlon — A Reading Method Sp Review Grammar *New York* Harper, 1938 297 pp \$1 60

Cione, E — Juan de Valdés *Bari* Laterza, 1938 195 pp

Cortés, N A. — El pronombre 'se' y la voz pasiva castellana *Valladolid* 1939 58 pp

Darnet, A J — Un Diálogo de Luciano romanceado en el siglo XV *Buenos Aires* Inst de Filología, 1939

Davies, R T — The Golden Century of Sp *London* Macmillan, 1937 ix + 327 pp 16 sh

Dietrich, G — Syntaktisches zu Kahlila wa Dimna *Kircham Zahn*, 1937 151 pp

El español en México, los Estados Unidos y la América Central, ed P Henríquez Ureña *Buenos Aires* Univ de Buenos Aires, 1938 lxi + 526 pp \$8 00 arg

Hilton, Ronald — Campoamor, Spain, and the New World *Toronto* U of Toronto Press, 1940 152 pp

Krabbe, L — Das Problem der Frau in den Romanen von Palacio Valdés *Munster* diss, 1938. 62 pp

Leslie, J K — Ventura de la Vega and the Sp Theater 1820-65 *Princeton*. 1940 xiv + 143 pp

Levy, Bernard. — Present-Day Spanish *New York* Cordon, 1940 xiv + 360 pp

Mendes Pinheiro da Silva — Etudes portugaises *Lisbon* Inst para a Alta Cultura, 1938 141 pp

Menéndez Pelayo, M — Antología de sus obras Notas de M Artigas *Valladolid* Cultura Esp, 1938

Meyn, L — Leer para saber, y saber para contar *Leipzig* Rohmkopf, 1939 176 pp

Monteiro de Barros Lins, I — Lope de Vega *Rio de Janeiro* Oliveira, 1935 212 pp

Moog, V — Eça de Queiroz e o século XIX *Pôrto Alegre* Globo, 1938 356 pp

Moreno, A — Lições de análise, de fonética e de ortografia *Oporto*. Ed Nat, 1937 261 pp

— Lições de linguagem *Ibid*, 1938 307 pp

Peres Montenegro, J — Vocabulário ortográfico, prosódico e iemissivo da lingua port *Lisbon* Eds SIT, 1938 xx + 688 pp

Piccolo, Fr — C M Da Costa Saggio sulla letteratura brasiliana del Settecento *Rome* Amici del Brasile, 1939 93 pp

Piel, J M — Os nomes germânicos na toponímia port *Lisbon* Junta de Educação Nac, 1936 220 pp

Ramos, S — El perfil del hombre y la cultura en Mexico *Mexico* Espasa-Calpe, 1939

Reemtsen, R — Spanisch-deutsche Beziehungen zur Zeit des ersten Dreihund vertrages 1882 7 *Berlin* Ebering, 1938 125 pp

Riva-Aguero, J de la — Lope de Vega *Milan* Treves, 1937 99 pp

St. Amour, Sister Mary Paulina — A study of the Villancico up to Lope de Vega *Diss Washington* Catholic U, 1940 x + 131 pp

Salinas, Pedro — Reality and the Poet in Spanish Poetry *Baltimore* Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 x + 165 pp \$2 00

Sánchez, L A — La literatura del Perú *Buenos Aires* Universidad, 1939 189 pp

Schneider, M — La Colocación del Pro-nombre *Buenos Aires* Inst de Filología, 1939

Vega, Lope de — La "Dorotea," studio critico e traduzione di Alda Croce *Bari*. Laterza, 1940 353 pp

América *Buenos Aires* Inst de Filología, 1939

Silva, J. B — Hist de la literatura esp *Buenos Aires* Peuser, 1938 462 pp \$6 00 arg

Sergio de Sousa, A — Em tôrno do problema da "língua brasileira" *Lisbon* Tip da Seara Nova, 1937 35 pp

Vossler, K — La vida espiritual en Sud-América *Buenos Aires*. Inst de Filología, 1939

## GENERAL

Chadwick, H M and N K — The Growth of Lit III *Cambridge* Univ Press, *New York* Macmillan, 1940 xxviii + 928 pp 9 00

Geddes, James, Jr — My Library *Bibliographical Biographical Repr from Boston U Alumni Mag*, 1939 40 46 pp

Guérard, Albert — Preface to World Lit *New York* Holt, 1940 xvi + 536 pp \$2 80

Priebatsch, H — Die Josephgeschichte in der Weltliteratur *Breslau* Marcus, 1937 xviii + 197 pp M 7 20

Tancock, L W and Gilhes, A. — The Year's Work in Mod Lang Studies, X *Cambridge* U Press, 1940 vi + 142 pp 8 s 6 d

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LV

JUNE, 1940

Number 6

---

## MILTON'S USE OF WOLLEB AND AMES

In his recent illuminating study of Milton's Christian doctrine,<sup>1</sup> Professor Sewell, expanding earlier articles, has delved further into the relationship of Milton's thought to that of the seventeenth century Calvinist theologians, and has found detailed indebtedness to Wolleb's *Compendium* and Ames's *Medulla*, but at several crucial points I believe it can be shown that Mr Sewell has missed the true interpretation of Milton's use of these authors

We are told, for example, that there is evidence of significant omissions in the *De Doctrina*, the most notable being the treatment of Satan compared with the picture in *Paradise Lost*. It is argued that the epic shows considerable indebtedness to Ames, who was also Milton's source for an earlier and ampler version of the *De Doctrina*, on the subject, when Milton lost interest in Satan, the extended treatment was omitted or cancelled.<sup>2</sup> This is a rather unwarranted speculation, for Milton was confessedly using Wolleb as well as Ames as a source, and at this point follows Wolleb rather closely. Mr Maurice Kelley, in a review<sup>3</sup> of Mr Sewell's book, has already expressed his dissatisfaction with the latter's use of the *argumentum e silentio*, but I hope to go further and show why the speculation is unwarranted. The mere fact that Wolleb's exposition is no longer than Milton's is itself enough to cast doubt on the idea that Milton must once have felt that an extended treatment of Satan would be expected from him in a work on systematic theology. But we can go further. The opening part of Milton's treatment of the Fall, both before and after that of Satan, is organically related to (is, indeed, a condensation of) the corresponding section in the *Com-*

<sup>1</sup> A. Sewell, *A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine* (London, 1939).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> M. Kelley, *MP*, xxxvii (1939), 103.

*pendum* (And if this is true, then this section of the *De Doctrina*, far from being part of a late revision, may well be as early as any )

If one omits from Wolleb the material to which there is no parallel in Milton, one finds the same topics treated in identical order, 1 e, God's Providence or government seen in the state of sin and misery, definition of sin on the basis of 1 *John* 3, 4, explanation that in the *John* passage, the word Law refers both to the law of nature or conscience and to the special commands and prohibitions of God, sin of Adam and Eve connected with the forbidden tree, place of the Devil and of the human will in the Fall, sin of Adam and Eve, the catalogue of all crimes. This is in itself striking, but more so is both the presence and absence of verbal parallelism. Every young instructor, preparing his first lectures, has, I suppose, drawn largely on previous authorities, but he is careful to re-phrase his sources. So Milton, preparing his outline of dogmatics, might well introduce synonyms to cover his real indebtedness. I append and number the relevant passages so that the closeness of the parallels may be observed.

*De Doctrina*,<sup>4</sup> pp 178-180

- 1) Providentia Dei lapsum hominis respiciens peccato eius et miseria inde consecuta cernitur, tum in eius restitutione
- 2) Peccatum, uti ab ipso Apostolo definitur, est *avoula*, seu legis transgressio, 1 Ioan iii 4
- 3) Legis nomine primario hic intelligitur, illa hominis menti insita et innata deinde illa ore Dei prolata, Gen ii 17 *de isto ne comedit* nam lex per Moesen scripta longe posterior fuit de qua Rom ii 12 quicumque sine lege peccaverunt, sine lege quoque peribunt
- 4) Peccatum est vel omnium hominum commune vel cuiusque proprium Omnium commune, quod abiecta prorsus obedientia, fructoque vetitae arboris degustato, primi parentes atque in iis omnes eorum posterii commiserunt
- 5) Primi parentes Gen iii 6 *accepit mulier de fructu, et comedit, et dedit viro, qui comedit* hinc 1 Tim ii 14 *Adam non fuit seductus, sed mulier seducta, causa transgressionis fuit* Peccatum hoc primum ab instigatione diaboli fuit, ut ex gesta re constat Gen iii et I Ioan iii 8 *qui facit peccatum, ex diabolo est, quoniam a principio diabolus peccat* Deinde a natura hominis non immutabili profectum, ex qua ille, sicut antea diabolus, *in veritate non perstitit*, Ioan viii 44 neque suam originem servavit, sed domicilium reliquit, Iudae 6

---

<sup>4</sup> The references here and throughout are to the Columbia edition of Milton's works

- 6) et si quis attentius paulo animadvertat, atrocissimum, et totius legis transgressionem iniuria dixerit

Sub hoc enim quid non perpetravit homo, credulitate in Satanam, incredulitate in Deum iuxta damnandus, infidelis, ingiatus, inobsequens, gulosus, uxorius hic, mariti illa observantior, uterque suae prolis, totius generis humani, parricida, fur, et alieni raptor, sacri legus, fallax, divinitatis insidiosus, et indignus affectator, supeibus, arrogans

*Compendium*,<sup>5</sup> pp 40-42

- 1) Tantum de gubernatione hominis in statu innocentiae Gubernatio hominis in statu miseriae est, qua Deus hominem in peccatum sponte prolapsus variis miseriis iusto iudicio subiecit Consistit igitur hic status in peccato, et miseriis peccatum consequentibus
- 2) Peccatum est *ἀνομία*, seu quicquid Legi divini repugnat
- 3) I Joh iii 4 Legis nomine hoc loco tum praecepta et interdicta homini primitus proposita, tum Lex Naturae cordi ejus insculpta intelligitur De Legis autem post lapsum instauratione ac ampliatione infra agatur suo loco
- 4) Peccatum primum est, aut ex primo ortum  
Primum peccatum est inobedientia primorum parentum, qua Dei interdictum de arbore scientiae boni et mali sunt transgressi
- 5) Causa ejus *προκαταρκτική* fuit, antiqua illius serpentis, Satanae, instinctus et persuasio  
Causa *προηγούμενη* erat, voluntas hominis, per se quidem ad bonum et malum indifferens, sed Satanae persuasionem ad malum inflexa
- 6) Partes hujus lapsus si spectes, recte totius legis naturalis transgressionem dixeris

Peccavit enim homo incredulitate, diffidentia, *ἀχαριστία*, idololatria, qua a Deo deficit, et ex seipso idolum facere satagit, Verbi Dei contemptu, rebellionem, homicidio, intemperantia, furore, rei alienae, inconsulto domino, contrectatione, falsi testimonii assensu, ambitiosa denique altioris dignitatis, imo gloriae soli Deo competentis, affectatione Unde nimis stricte peccatum hoc per intemperantiam, ambitionem, aut superbiam definitur

Secondly, Mr Sewell declares that there are traces in the *De Doctrina* of Milton's not always having held the view—*omnia ex Deo*—which dominates the treatment of creation in the treatise He notices that Milton distinguishes between God's generation of the Son out of his own substance, and the less intimate formation of

<sup>5</sup> J Wollebius, *Compendium Theologiae Christianae* (London, 1760) These parallels seem to have been passed over in Mr Kelley's otherwise exhaustive article, "Milton's Debt to Wollebe's *Compendium Theologiae Christianae*," in *PMLA*, L (1935), 156 ff



Adam from the dust of the earth;<sup>6</sup> he notices also that Milton, although he had declared that the world (being "out of God") was indestructible later<sup>7</sup> considers it of no importance to determine whether the destruction of the substance of the world may take place. Now, inasmuch as Milton was attempting to use orthodox terms in an unorthodox way, to say that God "created" the world and yet mean that God did not "create out of nothing," it would be surprising indeed if there were no traces of orthodox teaching here and there, which is the very most we can find, in either of the passages cited. But Mr. Sewell believes he can show traces<sup>8</sup> not of orthodoxy but of what he calls the "logical" view that God fashioned the worlds out of a pre-existent substance or matter other than God, and his basis for the statement is the really extraordinary claim that such views are to be found in Wolleb.

It is true that Wolleb does distinguish two kinds of creation, the one *ex nihilo*, the other *ex materia naturaliter inhabili*, but it is surely obvious what a seventeenth-century Biblical theologian, tied to the *Genesis* story, had in mind—that the miraculous creative power of God was shown not only in creating inorganic matter out of nothing, but also in making man out of the already created dust of the ground. As Wolleb puts it: "Creare, non tantum est ex nihilo aliquid facere, sed etiam ex materia inhabili supra naturae vires aliquid producere",<sup>9</sup> or again "Triplex miraculosa corporis humani productio in Scripturis traditur. Prima, ex pulvere terrae sine patre et matre. Secunda, ex costa Adam sine matre. Tertia, ex Virgine beatae sanguine sine patre."<sup>10</sup> There is thus no ground for holding that Milton got from Wolleb any view that the worlds, far from being created out of nothing, were fashioned out of a pre-existent dust, which the "Creator" simply utilized.

Lastly, "Milton found in Ames's *Medulla* the idea which became central in his view of the process by which man may finally become one with God", for in Ames's view "all things tend towards God from whom they proceed."<sup>11</sup> Mr. Sewell unaccountably misunderstands Ames, who carefully explains what he means: "Now naturall things tend unto God 1. In that they declare God's glory 2. That they give occasion to us to knowe, and seeke God 3. In that they

<sup>6</sup> *De Doctrina*, xiv, 187

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, xvi, 369

<sup>8</sup> Sewell, *op cit.*, pp. 15 and 40

<sup>9</sup> Wolleb, *op cit.*, I, v, p. 27

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, I, v, p. 30

<sup>11</sup> Sewell, *op cit.*, p. 43

sustaine our life, that we may live well unto God."<sup>12</sup> There is no trace here of an evolutionary universe becoming more and more divine, nor is there any parallel drawn between the destiny of the natural world and that of man. A better analogy to Milton's "scale of perfection" might have been found in a later chapter of Ames, where he mentions God's promise to man "of continuing animall life and of exalting it afterward to spirituall,"<sup>13</sup> an idea which, however, Milton need not have borrowed from Ames, since it was common stock of both Catholicism and Protestantism, it refers moreover to pre-lapsarian conditions and casts no light on how "man may finally become one with God." In Ames's view at least, man's eternal welfare depends, since the Fall, radically on the mediation of Christ.

The relation of Milton's thought to that of Ames and Wolleb is, as Mr Sewell has helped to show, often close in detail, but it is misrepresented by him on numerous occasions, of which these are but samples. In any case, neither Milton's theological originality, nor his intellectual and imaginative debt to Christian thought, can be appreciated unless we extend our gaze beyond the Calvinist epigoni to the men who created Christian dogma.

T. S. K. SCOTT-CRAIG

Hobart College

---

#### THE DATE OF MILTON'S *PROPOSALLS FOR A FIRME GOVERNMENT*

In the eighteenth volume of the Columbia *Milton* is printed, possibly for the first time, a little known prose work of the poet's of which the full title is *Proposalls of Certaine Expedients for the Prevention of a Ciuill War Now Feard, & the Settling of a Firme Government*. The Columbia editors, Professors Mabbott and French, who are apparently the only ones who have dealt with this document, do not directly discuss its date, though the slender evidence they present to suggest that it may have been printed as a separate tract in 1659 leaves the reader to infer that it was composed some-

<sup>12</sup> W. Ames, *Medulla Theologica*, translated by himself as *The Marrow of Sacred Divinity* (London, n. d.), p. 106

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48

time during that year<sup>1</sup> I believe it is possible to show that the *Proposals* was written between October 20 and December 26, 1659

On the 20th October, 1659, Milton addressed to an unknown friend the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth*, a work which the Columbia editors curiously fail to mention in their remarks on the relation of the *Proposals* to Milton's other political writings. The *Proposals* is like this letter in containing the suggestion that the principal army chiefs be given life tenure,<sup>2</sup> a suggestion which appears in neither edition of *The Ready and Easy Way* nor in the *Letter to Monk*, which cannot be earlier than February, 1660.<sup>3</sup> The idea was a concession to the demands of the situation which prevailed in the last months of 1659 when the army regime was dominant in London after Lambert's coup on the 13 October. It was no essential part of Milton's political philosophy, as the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth* itself makes clear,<sup>4</sup> and with the collapse of the army regime in the last days of the year we hear no more of it. Hence the *Proposals* is earlier in date than either *The Ready and Easy Way* or the *Letter to Monk*. Indeed it must be more than a month earlier than *The Ready and Easy Way*, since on the 26 December, 1659, Parliament resumed its sitting, and Milton's suggestion that the Parliament be again treated with to sit shows conclusively that he was writing before this event occurred and even before it became obvious that it was going to occur.

On the other hand, the *Proposals* contains an emphatic statement that members of the grand or supreme council should have life tenure. This principle is a central feature of both *The Ready and Easy Way* and the *Letter to Monk*.<sup>5</sup> Now it is true that the idea appears also in the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth*,<sup>6</sup> but it is there much less insistently advocated than in the later documents. Milton, indeed, goes so far as to say that "whether

<sup>1</sup> See their note to the Columbia text, p. 501, and their earlier observations in *N & Q*, CLXXIII, 86, 24 July, 1937.

<sup>2</sup> VI, 105. This and all subsequent references to Milton's works are to the Columbia edition.

<sup>3</sup> As Professor E. M. Clark points out in his edition of *The Ready and Easy Way* (New Haven, 1915), pp. xff, the first edition was composed in the main between the 4 February and the 21 February, 1660. The *Letter to Monk* is, of course, not earlier.

<sup>4</sup> VI, 102-03.

<sup>5</sup> VI, 126, 108-09.

<sup>6</sup> VI, 105.

the Civil Government be an annual Democracy, or a perpetual Aristocracy, is not to me a Consideration for the Extremities wherein we are,"<sup>7</sup> but in *The Ready and Easy Way* he will admit as an alternative to life tenure only a restricted rotation, and he argues against this with all the resources at his command.<sup>8</sup> Clearly the movement of Milton's thought from October, 1659, to February, 1660, was toward greater insistence on the principle of life tenure for members of the supreme council and less willingness to make concessions regarding it. From these circumstances it would seem that the *Proposalls* is certainly later than the *Letter concerning the Ruptures of the Commonwealth*. There are other facts which point to the same conclusion. The *Letter* is the product of obvious haste. Its ideas are not clearly and sharply defined, and there is evidence, as Masson pointed out,<sup>9</sup> that it was written when Milton, preoccupied with the question of ecclesiastical reform, was jolted by Lambert's coup into realization that a political settlement was the real question of the hour. On the other hand, the ideas in the *Proposalls*, like those in *The Ready and Easy Way*, are sharply and definitely defined in a manner which indicates that they were considered judgments.

I conclude that the *Proposalls* was written between the 20 October and the 26 December, 1659, and certainly at least some days removed from either extreme. This date means that the document, whether it be an independent tract, as Professors Mabbott and French believe,<sup>10</sup> or whether it is an early draft of *The Ready and Easy Way*, as was suggested in the auction catalogue which listed it,<sup>11</sup> marks a stage in the development of Milton's political thought in the crucial period from October, 1659, to February, 1660, and it is possibly in this fact that its main significance resides. Inasmuch as the proposal concerning the life tenure of the army officers is the main difference between it and *The Ready and Easy Way*, the *Proposalls* shows that in most essentials the ideas which Milton embodied in February in his elaborated plan for a free commonwealth had taken definite form in his mind before the end of the preceding year.<sup>12</sup> The point is not unimportant, for a comparison

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*<sup>9</sup> *Life of Milton*, v, 628<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*<sup>8</sup> vi, 127 ff<sup>10</sup> xviii, 501

<sup>12</sup> Common to the two works are the setting up of abjuration of a single person as a requirement for eligibility to the government, the idea that the attempt to control religion is the source of many, if indeed not most, of



marriage to the Lady Honora had just been given as fourteen years subsequent to his son's birth

A record of one mistress, three wives, and one son ascribed to the wrong mother required further search. The *Ashstead Records* offered a more surprising entry. Sir Robert married

I Mrs Uphill—second wife according to Edmondson. If Mrs Uphill was his first wife, he must have been a widower at 24 as his son, by Lady Honora, was born in 1651

II Honora O'Brien, coheir of Henry Earl of Thomond. Edm gives the lady the position of first wife

III Annabella Dives, said to be the eldest dau of John Dives, d 1728 \*

A third account, *Memorials of the Howard Family*, states that he had four wives.<sup>3</sup> This statement is confirmed by Collins's *Peerage*.<sup>4</sup>

Investigation of original sources was imperative. The Rev. G. Herbert Jeurwine, rector of Church Oakley, Basingstoke, Hants, arranged a visit to his church, where the parish register, a single volume in which all entries since 1559 have been made, yielded the following information

Sr Robert Howard son of y<sup>e</sup> Earle of Berks and Mrs Anna Kingsmill second daughter of Richard Kingsmill of Malhanger were married y<sup>e</sup> first of Februarie 1644 (N S 1645)

Mr. Montague Summers, perhaps following the *Dictionary of National Biography*, says 1646 was the date of the marriage, but this is obviously impossible as the oldest son, Robert, was born "Februarie 1645." Under the date 1650 there appears

Thomas Howard sonne of Sr Robert Howard was baptized the twentie first day of February 1650 (N S 1651)

Ann Kingsmill is obviously the mother of Thomas. No record, however, has been found of her death

On the 10th of August, 1665, Howard married the Lady Honoria (the spelling Honora does not appear in any of the official documents which I found). She was the daughter of Henry, fifth Earl

\* A. C. Lomax, *Some Records of the Ashstead Estate and of its Howard Possessors*, Appendix, Pedigree of the Earls of Berkshire. Litchfield, 1873

<sup>3</sup> Henry Howard, *Indications of Memorials, Monuments, Paintings, and Engravings of Persons of the Howard Family* (Corby Castle, 1834), I, 69

<sup>4</sup> Arthur Collins, *The Peerage of England*, ed. Brydges, III, 162

of Thomond, from whom she inherited considerable wealth. A strong royalist, Thomond had been given power of

treating and parleying with Rebels and Traitors. He had twenty shillings a day by grant under the Privy Seal. By will in 1617 he bequeathed £2000 to his daughters Ann and Honora, as an increase in their fortunes. Dying without male heirs his dau. became coheirresses.<sup>5</sup>

This date 1617 indicates that the Lady Honoria was several years older than Sir Robert (who was not born until 1626), a fact which may largely account for his indifference to anything but her fortune. In addition to her father's wealth, she inherited extensive holdings from her first husband, Sir Francis Englefield of Wiltshire, who had died in May, 1665. He left her the manor of Wooten Bassett (esteemed at £2000 a year and later sold for £36,000) as well as the adjacent manor house of Vasterne. This latter property had a long and honorable history. Mary I bestowed Vasterne and Wooten Bassett, then part of the Queen's dower lands, upon Sir Francis Englefield early in 1555/6. An ardent Romanist, he forfeited under Elizabeth, but after his execution in 1587 for mixing in the affairs of Mary, Queen of Scots, the family regained possession.<sup>6</sup> The Lady Honoria was in every respect the equal of Howard, now a favorite of Charles II, and their marriage was arranged by the king.

Whether Howard had any affection for his second wife we may well question, for by October, 1666, his affair with Susanna Uphill, one of the actresses of the King's Theatre, was well known.<sup>7</sup> By the following spring his free use of his new wife's money had brought their relations to an impasse. About the middle of March Lady Honoria petitioned for relief because Sir Robert had "fallen far from the promise made at the time of marriage."<sup>8</sup> On the sixteenth the Lord Chancellor wrote to Lord Arlington that he had begun a reply to his letter "when the king came in . . . The King having recommended her such a husband, cannot refuse to take notice of her complaint."<sup>9</sup> On the seventeenth Arlington wrote that the King had referred the case to several eminent noblemen.

<sup>5</sup> *Ashstead Records*, p. 59.

<sup>6</sup> Ethel M. Richardson, *The Lion and the Rose* (London, n.d.), p. 257.

<sup>7</sup> Evelyn, *Diary*, 18 October, 1666.

<sup>8</sup> *State Papers Domestic*, Entry Book no. 18, p. 246.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, v. 194, no. 33.

But apparently nothing was done. On the twenty-first the Lady Honoria, now rather desperate, repeated her petition

Whereas S<sup>r</sup> Rob<sup>t</sup> Howard for a year past hath refused to cohabit w<sup>th</sup> y<sup>e</sup> pet<sup>er</sup> but left her for some time but 6<sup>s</sup> a week toward the supporting her selfe family & the keeping of a coach (Tho he and his children are by y<sup>e</sup> pet<sup>er</sup> estate enabled to live bontifully) but for the space of five weeks last past, he hath forbidden tradesmen to trust her, wherby she is exposed to much hardship and must be in a starving condition & S<sup>r</sup> Rob<sup>t</sup> did declare y<sup>t</sup> he would put y<sup>e</sup> pet<sup>er</sup> in a chamber & she should live on bread and water & only have 5d a week And upon severall occasions profes<sup>t</sup>h y<sup>e</sup> pet<sup>er</sup> to submitt & lie at his mercy w<sup>ch</sup> she dares not doo having already found sorow and crewel usage by him <sup>10</sup>

She asks for an Act of Parliament that she may support herself in a manner "suitable to her birth and fortune" Some settlement of their domestic difficulties was apparently reached, perhaps the Indenture referred to in her will as of 1671 A letter from John Verney 26 April, 1676, states that Sir Robert had "sold Wooten Bassett for £36,000 of which his lady is to have eight."<sup>11</sup>

The final record in this marriage is found in the will of the Lady Honoria, dated 6 September, 1676, and proved on the 12th of the same month

I the Lady Honoria Howard wife to S<sup>r</sup> Robert Howard knight by vertue of and in pursuance of Power to me allowed by our Indenture bearing date the twentieth day of October in the two and twentieth year of his now Majesties Raigne made between S<sup>r</sup> Robert and myselfe . do make and ordain this my last will and Testament as followeth First I comend my body to be buried as near as conveniently may be to the place where my former husband S<sup>r</sup> Francis Englefield Baronett deceased was buried in the Englefield Church Likewise it is my desire to have noe other monument or Tombe over my dead body than a Convenient Black marble polished which I would have laid over S<sup>r</sup> Francis Englefield and myselfe, <sup>12</sup>

Any doubt which these provisions might leave as to her attitude toward Sir Robert is dispelled by a further clause. After a large number of bequests, such as one to the Earl of Anglesey for fifty pounds to buy a mourning ring, ten pounds to the minister who should read her burial service, full mourning and a year's wages to all her servants, fifty pounds to her Executors to buy them mourn-

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, v 218, no 63

<sup>11</sup> Hist MSS Com. 7th Report, appendix, p 467

<sup>12</sup> 122 Bence



ing and another fifty "for a Legacie to buy each of them a ring," there occurs one crisp statement "Item unto S<sup>r</sup> Robert Howard one shilling"

On Saturday, May 2, 1668, there was produced at Lincoln's Inn Fields Shadwell's play called the *Sullen Lovers or the Impertinents*. In this play Sir Robert was openly caricatured as Sir Positive-at-All and Mrs. Uphill as Lady Vaine. Although she had played only small roles, she was one of Killebrew's earliest actresses and was well known to the theatre-going public. Theophilus Cibber wrote of this play

Thomas Shadwell the poet was so angry with the knight for his supercilious domineering manner of behaving, that he points him out under the name of Sir Positive At-All, one of the characters in the *Sullen Lovers* or the *Impertinence*, and among the same persons is the Lady Vaine, a Courtesan, which the wits understood to be the mistress of Sir Robert Howard, whom he afterward thought proper to marry.<sup>13</sup>

Mr. Summers in *The Playhouse of Pepys* says that on the death of Howard's second wife (which he erroneously places in 1678) "Susanna Uphill was wedded to her constant admirer"<sup>14</sup> Anthony à Wood referring to the *Sullen Lovers* states

Among the persons is the Lady Vaine which the wits then understood to be the miss of Sir Robert Howard, whom, after he had for some time kept, he made her his wife.<sup>15</sup>

As register after register failed to produce any record of the marriage, I was inclined to doubt whether it had actually taken place. In the official *Westminster Register*, however, I found a reference to "his relict Annabella" as "his fourth wife,"<sup>16</sup> so we may apparently accept as fact that Susanna Uphill was Sir Robert's third wife.

That Annabella Dives was Howard's last wife is accepted by all biographers. Luttrell on Tuesday February 28, 1692/3, wrote, "Sir Robert Howard on Sunday last married young Mrs. Dives, maid of honor to the princesse, aged about 18"<sup>17</sup> She was the daughter of John Dives, esq., Clerk of the Privy Council.<sup>18</sup> The *Ashstead Records* says of her

<sup>13</sup> *Lives of the Poets*, III, 58

<sup>15</sup> *Athenae Oxonienses*, III, 595

<sup>14</sup> P 167

<sup>16</sup> P 243

<sup>17</sup> Luttrell, *A Brief Relation of State Affairs*, III, 45

<sup>18</sup> *Westminster Register*, p 243

In 1698 the songs of Purcell were published with dedication to Lady Howard, who, as there alleged, possessed "extraordinary skill in music" She had been a pupil of Purcell and some of his best music compositions were made for her entertainment and recommended by her performance Her Ladyship has placed a tablet to his memory in Westminster Abbey <sup>19</sup>

Howard died 3 September, 1698, and was buried in St. John the Baptist's Chapel, Westminster, on the eighth <sup>20</sup> On the day of the funeral Luttrell wrote, "He left by will to his lady 40,000£" <sup>21</sup> Howard's own will proved 7 September, 1698, indicates a very different attitude toward the young Lady Howard from that shown to Lady Honoria

I do give devise and bequeath unto my most dear and affectionate wife Dame Annabella Howard all my share part and proportion of all profits benefits and advantages that may in any way arise <sup>22</sup>

Among these benefits and advantages was an estate (estimated by Luttrell to be worth £8,000 a year) which had been bequeathed him by Philadelphia, Lady Wentworth, in her will (dated 2 April, 1696, and proved in May) and which in his will Sir Robert took great pains to guarantee to his wife. His "said loving wife" was made sole executrix This fact and the signature as witness of "John Dyve" (undoubtedly Annabella's father) proves conclusively that Sir Robert found his fourth marriage highly satisfactory Only eighteen years of age, a talented musician, with entree to the inner court circle, Lady Howard perhaps did not mind too much that her husband was old and suffered from the gout She was mistress of his official London residence and of Ashstead, where, six months after her marriage, she had the honor of entertaining the Queen.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, she did not long mourn him, for she "remarried Rev Edward Martin of Somerton Co Oxford, and was buried at Hammersmith Midx 7 Sept, 1728." <sup>24</sup>

FLORENCE R SCOTT

*University of Southern California*

---

<sup>19</sup> P 55

<sup>20</sup> *Westminster Register*, loc cit

<sup>21</sup> Luttrell, *op cit*, IV, 424

<sup>22</sup> 201 Lort.

<sup>23</sup> Luttrell, *op cit*, p 56

<sup>24</sup> *Westminster Register*, p 243

SOME PLAGIARISMS IN 17TH CENTURY BOOKS OF  
ADVICE TO CHILDREN

In the ideas advanced in the many books of advice to children and youth in the seventeenth century there is naturally a good deal of similarity, for prudent and anxious parents, then as now, were concerned rather with perpetuating the truths of common experience than with testing newfangled theories. But sometimes the verbal similarities in these books are too close to be the result merely of common ideas. Lord Burghley's *Certainne precepts or directions for the well ordering of a man's life*, for instance, one of the most frequently reissued works of advice in the period, found towards the end of the century an admirer and copier in Sir Daniel Fleming the *Advice to a Son* ascribed to Fleming is simply a transcript of Burghley. And earlier in the century the Earl of Derby (1607-51) set down a "Second Letter to his Son Charles Lord Strange,"<sup>1</sup> also merely a transcript of Burghley, without noting that the letter was not an original composition. Though these two instances of copying have already been noted,<sup>2</sup> some others have apparently not.

Francis Osborne's *Advice to a Son* (1656) created much more of stir than did Burghley's *Precepts*.<sup>3</sup> Despite its popularity, however there was an attempt in 1659 to pass off *The Last Advice of Mr. Ben Alexander To His Children* as an original work.<sup>4</sup> It consists of two parts. In the second, "Containing Generall And

<sup>1</sup> In Chetham Soc, *Remains*, lxx, 42-47

<sup>2</sup> The first by W Sloane, "Sir Daniel Fleming's Plagiarism of Lord Burghley," *PQ*, xiii (1934), 302-4, the second by Paul V Jones, *The Household of a Tudor Nobleman* (Urbana, 1917), p. 24. Cf. also V B Heltzel in *Hunt Lib Bull*, April, 1937, p. 59, on the muddle created by attributing to an Earl of Bedford the *Advice to his Son* by Richard, Earl of Carberry.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the *Advice to a Son*, ed. E. A. Parry, London, 1896, Introduction, S. A. E. Betz, "A Study of Francis Osborne's 'Advice to a Son,'" in *Seventeenth Century Studies Second Series*, ed. Robert Shafer, Princeton, 1937, and John E. Mason, *Gentlefolk in the Making* (Philadelphia, 1935), pp. 75, 76, 81, 104, 159, and 175.

<sup>4</sup> The title-page describes the author as "Late Minister of West-Markham," Nottinghamshire. A Benjamin Alexander was admitted a pensioner of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, at Easter term, 1635, and received his B. A. in 1638-9. (Cf. *The Book of Matriculations and Degrees, 1544-1659*, compiled by J. and J. A. Venn, Cambridge, 1913.)

Particular Advice, Touching Religion, Opinion, Morality, Government, Study, Marriage," the precepts are all merely diluted versions of those in Osborne, except in the section on marriage. There Alexander shies away from the cynical misogyny which was a partial cause of the furore created by Osborne's work, and contents himself with seven small and very general precepts. Otherwise every idea and most of the phrasing, though somewhat watered, come from Osborne. Even the minister of West Markham's comments on religion come from Osborne, in spite of the fact that the godly ministers had previously tried to suppress the *Advice to a Son* by laying charges before the Oxford authorities that the religious teachings in the book tended to atheism.

Another and a more obvious case of borrowing from Osborne appears in the *Twenty Precepts, Or, Rules of Advice to a Son By a late Eminent Lawyer* (1682), a single sheet printed on both sides.<sup>5</sup> This is a patchwork of sentences taken bodily from Osborne, the wording practically identical. Each of the twenty precepts comprises one, two, or three admonitions from various sections of Osborne's book.<sup>6</sup>

More serious than these borrowings from Osborne and Burghley, however, has been the inaccurate attribution of the *Advice To a Young Lord, Written by his Father* (1691) to Thomas, fifth Baron Fairfax.<sup>7</sup> For the work is clearly a condensation with slight re-

<sup>5</sup> Copies in Brit. Mus. and Bodleian. David Ogg, in his *England in the Reign of Charles II* (Oxford, 1934), II, 705, cites and summarizes these twenty precepts without apparently knowing that they are really Osborne's, produced nearly thirty years before.

<sup>6</sup> Most of the precepts (Nos. 1-6, 17, and 18) are taken from Osborne's first chapter, on study. Almost as many (Nos. 9-14 and 16) are from his fourth chapter, on government. Precepts 7 and 19 are from Osborne's second chapter, on marriage. Precepts 15 and 20 are from his fifth chapter, on religion. And precept 8 is from his third chapter, on travel.

<sup>7</sup> Edward Arber lists the *Advice To a Young Lord* in the *Term Catalogues* (II, 385), in the title-index to which (II, 610) he gives the author's name as T. Fairfax. Halkett and Laing, in the *Dict. of Anon. and Pseudon. Lit.*, attribute the *Advice* to Fairfax and cite Arber, II, 610. The *Advice* is entered in the revised British Museum catalogue under its title, and the supposed author's name, Thomas Fairfax, 5th Baron Fairfax, is supplied in brackets along with a cautionary question-mark. The book is listed, along with Fairfax's name and a question-mark in parentheses, in Gertrude E. Noyes' *Bibliography of Courtesy and Conduct Books in Seventeenth-*

visions of the *Instructions to a Son* (printed at Edinburgh, and reprinted at London for D Trench, 1661), written by Archibald Campbell first Marquis of Argyle R Baldwin, the publisher of the *Advice To a Young Lord* in 1691, also published a 1689 edition of Argyle's *Instructions*. All the references that had been made in the *Instructions* to Scotland, to the fallen glory of the Campbells, and to Argyle's own fate, are deleted from the *Advice To a Young Lord*. Each time the *Instructions* speak of the Kirk, the *Advice* refers to the Church. Aside from those changes, Argyle's 2nd chapter is the same as the *Advice*, chapter 4 ("Of Marriage"), his 3rd chapter the same as the *Advice*, chapter 6 ("Of the Court"), his 4th the same as chapter 7 ("Of Friendship"), his 5th the same as chapter 3 ("Of Travel"), his 8th the same as chapter 2 ("Of Study and Exercise"), and his 9th the same as chapter 8 ("Of Pleasure and Idleness"). Argyle's chapters "Of Tenants and other concerns of Estate" and "Considerations of Life" and the collected maxims of state are omitted from the *Advice*, the tenth chapter of which, "Of Conversation," is entirely new. The fifth chapter in the *Advice*, "Of House-keeping and Hospitality," which parallels Argyle's sixth chapter, slightly expands Argyle's denunciation of drunkenness. The first chapter in the *Advice*, like that in Argyle, concerns religion, but of necessity the two differ considerably, yet the *Advice* still retains some turns of phrase from Argyle, occasionally a whole sentence, sometimes even a whole paragraph. Despite the changes which have been made, however, the *Advice To a Young Lord* remains essentially and definitely the work of Argyle. There is no good reason why it should be attributed to the fifth Lord Fairfax.

WILLIAM SLOANE

Hamilton College

---

### "HOBGOBLIN RUNNE AWAY WITH THE GARLAND FROM APOLLO"

For some time now, Spenserian scholars have been studying the place of Arthurian legend in Elizabethan literature. The conclu-

*Century England*, New Haven, 1937. The *Advice*, as far as I know, was always published anonymously.

sions at which they have arrived, and which are now generally accepted, may be summarized briefly <sup>1</sup>

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, Polydore Vergil attacked the historical authenticity of the Arthurian epic. His challenge was taken up by native English antiquarians, who sought to prove not only the truth of the Arthurian story but also the right of the Tudor family to claim direct descent, both physical and spiritual, from Arthur. For the men of the later sixteenth century, therefore, the legend of Arthur became a vehicle of nationalist and patriotic emotions, and Elizabeth herself was regarded as a kind of reincarnation of her distant ancestor. Spenser, by making Arthur the central figure of *The Faerie Queene*, was appealing to nationalist rather than romantic sentiments in his readers.

Such, in essence, are the views which are now held, and it must be admitted that they are persuasive and well buttressed by evidence. We cannot, however, accept these views uncritically. If it is true that for some men of the sixteenth century the Arthurian legends were a great patriotic epic, it is none the less true that for other men of the same period they were superstitious and dangerous fables.

We are all acquainted with Gabriel Harvey's famous characterization of *The Faerie Queene* as "*Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo*" <sup>2</sup>. This remark has been universally taken as an indication of Harvey's temperamental inability to respond to romantic poetry. In fact, many critics have taken it as a sign of Harvey's lack of any poetic taste. Even his most sympathetic editor has been compelled to say of him

What failed him was that play of mind which can delight in dreams and shadows and music—what we call pure imagination, and there is no greater example of it than his faint praise of the *Faery Queene* in this letter <sup>3</sup>.

It is possible, however, that Harvey was not referring to the poetry of Spenser's masterpiece, but to its general plan and its intended use of certain material, and that by *Hobgoblin* he meant

<sup>1</sup> For an extended treatment of the thesis here summarized, see Edwin Greenlaw's *Studies in Spenser's Historical Allegory* (Baltimore, 1932), and Charles Bowie Millican's *Spenser and the Table Round* (Cambridge, 1932).

<sup>2</sup> In his *Three Proper and Wittie Familiar Letters*, 1580. See *The Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser*, ed. Smith and de Selincourt (London, 1924), p. 628.

<sup>3</sup> G. C. Moore Smith, ed., *Gabriel Harvey's Marginalia* (Stratford-upon-Avon, 1913), p. 31.

barbaric and irrational legend. This possibility becomes a distinct probability when we study a treatise by John Harvey, brother of Gabriel, which was published in 1588. *A Discursive Probleme*<sup>4</sup> is a work of the first importance for the critic of Spenser, but it has been almost completely neglected up to now.<sup>5</sup>

The book is a blistering attack upon the literary underworld of prophetic writings and ballads. Harvey clearly regards such works as harmful to true morality and religion, and incitements to sedition, and of all the false, cosening tales which he attacks, none are more bitterly criticized than those associated with the figure of Arthur. The principal heroes of the new philosophy and the new science are invoked by Harvey against the corners of prophecies, for he regards himself as the defender of rationalism, and the attack upon prophetic writings as the attack upon superstition and ignorance.

The best way to indicate the importance of *A Discursive Probleme* is by a series of direct quotations from the text. They are given without commentary, for they need none.

1 [Dedication to Sir Christopher Hatton]

No man either knoweth better, or can deeper consider, than your Lordship, how notoriously and perilously the world hath continually from time to time bene abused, and in sort cosened with supposed prophetes, and counterfet soothsayings, devised either for unknowen, or for ungracious and lewd causes intending at least Comicall sturs, but commonly fostering tragicall commotions. Not onely forraigne histories, both old and new, in all languages, as well learned, as vulgar but also our owne British and English Chronicles (as your Lordship best remembreth)<sup>6</sup>

2 Nay, is any devise easier, or any practise readier, than to forge a blinde prophetie, or to come a counterfet tale or finally, to revive somme forlorne Merlin, or Pierce Plowman, or Nostradame, or the like supposed prophet? Alas, is this wise world so simple, to beleve so foolish toyes, devised to mocke apes, and delude children?<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> A/ DISCURSIVE PRO-/BLEME concer-/ning Prophetes,/ How far they are to be valued, or credi-/ted, according to the surest rules and/ directions in Divinitie, Philoso-/phie, Astrologie, and other/learning / By I. H. Physition / Printed at London, by John/ Jackson, for Richard/ Watkins / 1588

<sup>5</sup> It is quoted in a footnote in Dr. Mary Parmenter's article, "Spenser *Twelve Aeglogues Proportionable to the Twelve Monethes*," *ELH*, III (1936), 197.

<sup>6</sup> *A Discursive Probleme*, sig. A4r.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2 (B1r).

3 Lift up your eyes, and looke into the Divinitie Schooles were Saint Augustine, S Ierom, S Ambrose, S Gregorie, or any notable Divine, either ancient or moderne, coiners or fosterers of propheties? Descend to the Mathematicall Schooles, heare you any such matter from the mouthes of Ptolomie, Copernicus, Rheniholdus, Iofrancus, Offusus, or any singular Mathematician? Proceede to the Philosophicall chaire and will Aristotle, Plinie, Cardane, Scalliger, Ramus or any excellent philosopher, busy your brains with any such raving, and senselesse conceits? <sup>8</sup>

4 My selfe have as well purposely, as incidently run over many propheties fathered upon Merlin, yea, more, I dare say, than ever that counterfet wrot, some in verse, othersome in prose, some in latin, othersome in english some written, some imprinted some in common letters, othersome in new founde Alphabets, and mysticall characters? <sup>9</sup>

5 For what a Godname can we thinke of [this prophetic writer's] other covenous, and sophisticall devises, or rather diabolicall practises, wherewith he, or the diuel in him, deluded and beguiled the simpler sort

Or what reckoning is indeede to be made of his Irish Lions, hideous woolves, despituous Antilops, griphins, buls, beares, foxes, moldwarps, swans, bussards, cranes, cocks, owles, and other fierce or tame creatures, are they not meere gewgawes to delight children, and very toyish cranks to mocke Apes? <sup>10</sup>

6 Everie age, every country, and every toong, howsoever barbarous, or civill, affordeth ynough, and ynough examples both of the learneded, and unlearneder stampe but of what better credit, or more value, than the tales of Robin hood, or the fables of Robin goodfellow & the Fairies, or the woonderous acts of Howleglasse, or the wizardly fortune-tellings of the runnagate counterfet AEgyptians, commonly termed Gypsies? <sup>11</sup>

7 Now touching the Finall why, or the generall and speciall ends thereof, were not these extravagant prophetes, mostwhat<sup>12</sup> invented and published to some such great holie effect as the tales of Hobgoblin, Robin Goodfellow, Hogmagog, Queene Grogorton, king Arthur, Bevis of Southhampton, Launcelot du Lake, Sir Tristram, Thomas of Lancaster, John à Gaunt, Guy of Warwike, Orlando furioso, Amadis du Gaul, Robin Hood and little John, Frier Tuck and maid Marian, with a thousand such Legendaries, in all languages, *vz* to busie the minds of the vulgar sort, or to set their heads aworke withal, and to avert their conceits from the consideration of serious, and graver matters, by feeding their humors, and delighting their fancies with such fabulous and ludicrous toyes <sup>12</sup>

These excerpts from *A Discoursive Probleme* are significant in many respects. They indicate the great vogue of prophetic literature in the late sixteenth century, they show that the Arthurian

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, p 5 (B3<sup>r</sup>)

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, p 52 (H2<sup>r</sup>)

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*, pp 54-55 (H3<sup>r</sup>-H4<sup>r</sup>)

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, p 63 (I4<sup>r</sup>)

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid*, pp 68-69 (K2<sup>r</sup>-K3<sup>r</sup>)



legends were associated with such other folk material as the stories of Hobgoblin and Robin Goodfellow, and, most important of all, they reveal that the Puritan mind was scandalized by the nature and popularity of prophetic writings. Each one of these points calls for extended investigation and discussion. This brief note is intended only to call attention to the problems involved.<sup>18</sup>

Above all, this note is intended to clear the reputation of Gabriel Harvey. His phrase, "Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo," was not the utterance of a man without poetic feeling, but an acute and discerning criticism of *The Faerie Queene* from the standpoint of a classicist. If we look at Harvey as the champion of humanism against medievalism, we shall understand and perhaps approve, the essential spirit of his remarks on Spenser's work.

SIDNEY THOMAS

*College of the City of New York*

### E S DALLAS IN TROLLOPE'S *AUTOBIOGRAPHY*

In Anthony Trollope's *Autobiography*, that repository of valuable information on the professional problems of Victorian writers, the author severely censures connivance between writers and the critics of their work, and relates the following incident as an illustration.

Some years since, a critic of the day, a gentleman well known then in literary circles, showed me the manuscript of a book recently published, the work of a popular author. It was handsomely bound, and was a valuable and desirable possession. It had just been given to him by the author, as an acknowledgment for a laudatory review in one of the leading journals of the day. As I was expressly asked whether I did not regard such a token as a sign of grace both in the giver and the receiver, I said that I thought that it should neither have been given nor have been taken. My theory was repudiated with scorn, and I was told that I was strait-laced, visionary and impracticable.<sup>1</sup> In all that the damage did not lie in the fact of that one present, but in the feeling on the part of the critic that his office was not debased by the acceptance of presents from those whom he criticized.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>18</sup> I intend to treat these problems in a forthcoming paper.

<sup>1</sup> *Autobiography of Anthony Trollope* (New York, 1883), 202. All references are to this edition of the *Autobiography*.

The "critic of the day" seems to have been E S Dallas,<sup>2</sup> the "popular author" Charles Dickens, and the present the manuscript of *Our Mutual Friend*. The story was told by Kate Field as early as 1874, and has been repeated in more recent years.

If I remember rightly, when "Our Mutual Friend" first appeared, E S Dallas, a brilliant journalist, wrote an appreciative review of it for "The London Times," which largely increased the sale of the book, and fully established its success. In grateful acknowledgment of this review, Dickens presented the manuscript work to Mr Dallas.

The review was published in *The Times* on November 29, 1865.<sup>4</sup> The autograph on the fly-leaf of the first volume of the manuscript is dated "Thursday, Fourth January, 1866."<sup>5</sup>

On another page of his *Autobiography*, Trollope remarks that three articles in *The Times* on his *The West Indies and the Spanish Main* "made the fortune of the book," and that "by that criticism I was much raised in my position as an author." Then he adds this comment:

<sup>2</sup> Author of *The Gay Science*, and literary reviewer for *The Times* during the eighteen-fifties and sixties.

<sup>3</sup> "Our Mutual Friend in Manuscript," *Scribner's Monthly*, VIII (1874), 472. See also J Holt Schooling, "Dickens's Manuscripts," *Strand Magazine*, XI (1896), 40, and Thomas Wright, *The Life of Charles Dickens* (London, 1935), 315. According to Schooling, "Shortly after Charles Dickens died, Mr Dallas sold the manuscript, and it was bought by Mr. George W Childs, of Philadelphia, for a large sum." The librarian of the Drexel Institute Library has informed me that Mr Childs presented the manuscript to the Library in 1891.

<sup>4</sup> The article is ascribed to Dallas in the editorial diaries of *The Times*, according to information made available to the writer through the courtesy of Sir Bruce Richmond. It was not the wholly "laudatory review" that Trollope implies. Dallas found serious faults in the novel: its beginning dragged, and Dickens' attempt at a "Social Chorus" only interrupted the story. "Mr. Veneering, and the Veneering set of people are so poor of wit and so dull of feeling that Mr Dickens has hard work to galvanize them into something like vitality," wrote Dallas. As long as the book was not wholly condemned, the publicity of a three-column notice in *The Times* would have affected its sale. It was for the publicity, as well as for the qualified praise of the critic, that Dickens was grateful. Had he known, and had he been interested in further disqualifying the critic, Trollope might have pointed out that only a few months before the review appeared, Dickens had written to Lord Russell on behalf of Dallas' candidacy for the Chair of English Literature in the University of Edinburgh. See *The Letters of Charles Dickens* (New York, 1879), II, 275-6.

<sup>5</sup> Field, *op cit*, p. 472.

I afterwards became acquainted with the writer of those articles, the contributor himself informing me that he had written them. I told him that he had done me a greater service than can often be done by one man to another, but that I was under no obligation to him. I do not think that he saw the matter in quite the same light<sup>6</sup>.

Again, the writer was Dallas, for it was he who reviewed Trollope's book in *The Times* in January, 1860<sup>7</sup>. And it must have been very shortly afterwards that Trollope became acquainted with Dallas, for the latter is mentioned as among those whom Trollope met "for the first time" at a "sumptuous dinner" given by George Smith, in the same January, for contributors to the then newly founded *Cornhill Magazine*<sup>8</sup>.

As for the unfavorable light in which Dallas appears in these references, it should be pointed out that Trollope's memory of him was perhaps inevitably unpleasant, for it had been Dallas' misfortune to be editor of *Once a Week* when the publishers of that journal were forced to withhold *The Vicar of Bullhampton*, contrary to their contract with Trollope, in favor of a novel by Victor Hugo.<sup>9</sup> It is interesting to note that, although Dallas died several years before the *Autobiography* was published, Trollope's disagreeable references to him are anonymous, but when he is mentioned by name in connection with Smith's dinner, he is "Dallas, who for a time was literary critic to *The Times*, and who certainly in that capacity did better work than has since appeared in the same department"<sup>10</sup>.

Yale University

FRANCIS X. ROELLINGER

<sup>6</sup> P 103 Trollope's testimony regarding the commercial value of a favorable notice in *The Times* throws light on George Eliot's remark in a letter to her publisher in 1859 "The best news from London hitherto is that Mr Dallas is an enthusiastic admirer of *Adam*" William Tinsley "heard it said" and could "quite believe it, that *The Times* review of the *Life of George Stephenson* was worth a good deal over a thousand pounds to Samuel Smiles" See *George Eliot's Life as Related in Her Letters and Journals*, ed J W Cross (New York, 1885), III, 64, and William Tinsley, *Random Recollections of an Old Publisher* (London, 1900), I, 129.

<sup>7</sup> According to a list of Dallas' contributions, taken from the editorial diaries of *The Times*. There seem to have been two, rather than three articles, published on January 6 and 18, 1860.

<sup>8</sup> *Autobiography*, p 138.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, pp 246-7. Again the reference to Dallas is anonymous. Mr Michael Sadleir has given a complete account of the affair in *Trollope, A Commentary* (London, 1927), 296-8.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*, p 119.

THE LETTERS OF RALPH WALDO EMERSON ADDENDA

The two letters here reproduced are significant, not so much for their content, but because they form links in the chronology established by Ralph L. Rusk in his recently published edition of *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (New York, 1939). Both of them are listed by Mr. Rusk but have not been published or located. The manuscripts are now in the possession of the Yale University Library.<sup>1</sup>

In II, 384, Mr. Rusk mentions a letter

To ———, CONCORD, MARCH 12, 1841

[MS listed in the American Autograph Shop, May, 1936,  
described as referring to a letter from Carlyle.]

The text of the following letter to an unknown correspondent, who has asked Emerson for autograph material, fits this description:

Concord, 12 March, 1841

My dear Sir

I am sorry not to find today anything to send you but a strip from Carlyle.<sup>2</sup> I have one note from Milnes,<sup>3</sup> which I thought I could easily give your friend, but on looking at it, it is a compliment not quite becoming to send away. I have two letters from Sterling,<sup>4</sup> but neither of them present

---

<sup>1</sup> The Yale University Library also owns the following unpublished notes, listed or connected with items listed by Mr. Rusk: (1) Autograph note signed, to W. S. Robinson, dated, Concord 15<sup>th</sup> July [1867?], and referring probably to Emerson's Phi Beta Kappa oration of July 18, 1867 (see Rusk, vi, 569), (2) Autograph note, to Mrs. Jean Davenport Lander, dated, Concord, Mass<sup>ts</sup> 30 December [1876] (see Rusk, vi, 300). The Library is also in the possession of an autograph note signed, to an unknown correspondent, dated, Concord 16 Oct [no year], and written concerning a lecture. This note is apparently not listed by Mr. Rusk. The Forbes Library, of Northampton, Massachusetts, has an autograph note signed, to Sidney Edwin Bridgman, dated, Concord Mass 25 May 1855, and giving the price of a lecture (cf. Rusk, iv, 524).

<sup>2</sup> The enclosure is a fragment of about four hundred words, clipped from a letter written by Thomas Carlyle to Emerson. In it the four Gospels are compared to cash accounts.

<sup>3</sup> The English poet, Richard Monckton Milnes, first Lord Houghton (1809-1885).

<sup>4</sup> John Sterling (1806-1844), English author.

any detachable part to the scissors except the signature, which, I think you said, you did not want In Carlyle's letters, of which I have a great many, I only found a single one from which an [sic] sentence could be cut away, without interfering with something on the next page But I will bear in mind your friend's wish, & perhaps ere long I can send her another name

Your friend & servant  
R Waldo Emerson

In iv, 248, Mr Rusk suggests the existence of a letter written by Emerson,

TO EMILY MERVINE DRURY, CONCORD? April c 17? 1851

[Emily Mervine Drury, Canandaigua, N Y, May 8 (endorsed 1851), thanked Emerson for the "kind note" she had received three (or two?) weeks since, she also mentioned a copy of the *Bhagavadgita* which he had lent her ]

This letter may now be identified as one which Emerson wrote on April 14, 1851, to his friend, Mrs Drury,<sup>5</sup> with whom he had long carried on a correspondence, and to whom he is now sending a copy of the Oriental religious book, the *Bhagavadgita*, which he had first come to know in the eighteen forties<sup>6</sup> The volume had made a decided impression upon him and in the letter he refers to it "as one of the bibles of the world," a phrase which he later incorporated into his essay on "Books"<sup>7</sup> More important to him at the moment, however, is his reaction to the slavery question in his home state, for in this letter he re-expresses his feelings on a subject which occupies many pages in his *Journals* The letter follows

<sup>5</sup> Mrs Drury was the daughter of Captain William Mervine of the United States Navy and the wife of Leander M Drury, United States pension agent at Canandaigua (1869) For other letters to her see Rusk, iv, *passim*, v, 25, 88-89, 190-191, 234

<sup>6</sup> He was probably familiar with the edition published under the title *The Bhāgavat-Gītā, or Dialogues of Krīṣṇā and Ārjūn* translated Charles Wilkins (London, 1785)

<sup>7</sup> See *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Centenary ed, Boston and New York, 1903-04), vii, 218, where he writes "I mean the Bibles of the world," and cites the *Bhagavadgita* as one of his examples The essay, "Books," first appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly* for January, 1858 Emerson and Bronson Alcott talked for some years of publishing a "Bible of the Nations" or "a Bible for Mankind," which would, of course, include the *Bhagavadgita* See *The Journals of Bronson Alcott*, ed Odell Shepard (Boston, 1938), pp. 136-137, 180, 383, [385], 388, etc.

Concord, 14 April 1851

My dear Mrs Drury,

I received your kind note just as I was leaving home for Pittsburgh, Pa.,<sup>8</sup> quite a month ago. The Bhagavad Geeta<sup>9</sup> had only a day or two earlier set forth on its travels, because my bookseller<sup>10</sup> told me, that it could not well find a safe carrier until their "Tradesales" began. I hope it has reached you ere now and when it comes, I confide that you will remember my rules, not to read it except in the best hours, & to read it as one of the bibles of the world. I am gratified, of course, that you find my books readable & veracious—to a degree. But you have not done what you were charged to do, I mean, to make the exceptions, & show the vices of these writings. But, at this moment, in the cruelty & the ignominy of the laws, & the shocking degradation of Massachusetts,<sup>11</sup> I have had no heart to look at books, or to think of anything else than how to retrieve this crime. All sane persons are startled by the treachery not only of the officials, but of the controlling public of the moment, in Boston. It is one sad lesson more to destroy all national pride, all reliance on others. "In ourselves our freedom must be sought"<sup>12</sup> But against & over all this, we must hope, & firmly assure ourselves

Your affectionate servant,  
R W Emerson

BARBARA DAMON SIMISON

*New Haven, Connecticut*


---

<sup>8</sup> On March 21, 1851, Emerson began, in Pittsburgh, his series of six lectures on the subject, "Conduct of Life." See James Elliot Cabot, *A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (3d ed., Boston and New York, 1888), II, 566-567, 754.

<sup>9</sup> One of Emerson's several spellings of *Bhagavadgita*.

<sup>10</sup> Emerson did business at the time with James Munroe & Company, 134 Washington Street, Boston. In a letter of May 14, 1851, quoted in Rusk, IV, 250, he suggests that his copy of the *Bhagavadgita* "could be left at James Munroe's."

<sup>11</sup> Early in 1851 Emerson had been disturbed by Daniel Webster's so-called treachery in supporting the Fugitive Slave Law. On May third of this year he even went so far as to denounce Webster publicly in an address at Concord.

<sup>12</sup> Here Emerson is doubtless misquoting, paraphrasing, or quoting an earlier version of the sixth line of Wordsworth's sonnet headed "November, 1806," which reads "That in ourselves our safety must be sought."

PARALLELS TO SOME PASSAGES IN *PROMETHEUS UNBOUND*

The following parallels are presented as a slight supplement to the collections in Weaver's *Toward the Understanding of Shelley* (1932), Clark's "Shelley and Shakespeare," *PMLA*, LIV, 261-287 (1939), and Droop's *Die Belesenheit Shelley's* (1906). They may serve as fresh illustrations of Shelley's great susceptibility to the influence of other writers.<sup>1</sup>

To me

Shall they become like *sister antelopes*

By one fair dam, snow-white and swift as wind,

*Nursed among lilies* near a brimming stream (*P U*, III, III, 96-9)

Thy two breasts are like two yong *Roes*, *that are twinnes*, which feed  
among the *lilies* (*Song of Solomon*, IV, 5)

And Conquest is dragged captive through the deep (*P U*, IV, 556)

When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive (*Ephesians*, IV, 8)

In the following passage Shelley seems to have been influenced both by Homer and by Vergil.

Trampling the slant winds on high

With golden-sandalled *feet*, that glow

Under plumes of *purple dye*,

Like *rose-ensanguined ivory*,

A Shape comes now (*P U*, I, 318-22)

As when some woman staineth *ivory* with *purple*, even in such  
wise, Menelaos, were thy shapely thighs stained with *blood* and thy legs  
and thy fair *ankles* beneath (*Iliad*, IV, 141-7, trans. Lang, Leaf, Myers)

*Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostio*

*si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa*

*alba rosa talis virgo dabat ore colores* (*Aeneid*, XII, 67-9)

I know ye, and these lakes and echoes know

The darkness and the *clangour* of your *wings* (*P U*, I, 459-60)

*Harpyiae et magnis quatunt clangoribus alas* (*Aeneid*, III, 226)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Pottle, *Shelley and Browning* (1923), p. 34, n. 1. That Shelley himself was aware of this susceptibility is implied in his Preface to *The Cenci*, footnote 2. See also the Preface to *P U*, the third paragraph from the end.

<sup>2</sup> Nitchie (*Vergil and the English Poets*, 1919, p. 198, n. 2) has noted in *P U*, II, II, 90-93 an allusion to Vergil, *Eclogue vi*, 31-42.

And new *fire*  
From earthquake-rifted mountains of bright snow  
*Shook* its portentous *hair* beneath Heaven's frown (*P U*, I, 166-8)

Viden ut *faces*  
Splendidas *quatunt comas*? (Catullus, LXI, 77 8 [cf 94 5])<sup>3</sup>

And Youth's smooth ocean, smiling to betray (*P U*, II, v, 100)

suggests Horace's metaphorical use of the ocean in his Ode to Pyrrha (I, v, 5-12)

Pity the self despising slaves of Heaven,  
Not me, *within whose mind* sits peace serene,  
As light in the sun, *throned* (*P U*, I, 429-31) <sup>4</sup>

But mercy is above this sceptred sway,  
It is *enthroned in the hearts* of kings (*Merchant of Venice*, IV, I, 192-3)

For men were slowly *killed by frowns* and smiles (*P U*, I, 590)

On whom, as in despite, the sun looks pale,  
*Killing* their fruit with *frowns* (*K Henry V*, III, v, 17-18)

Who made that sense which, when *the winds* of spring  
*In rarest visitation*, (*P U*, II, iv, 12 13)

And *in the visitation* of *the winds* (*K Henry IV*, Part 2, III, I, 21)

To these examples of the influence of earlier writers upon Shelley, I would add one of the influence of Shelley upon Browning:

Where the wild-bee never flew (*P U*, II, I, 180)

Where the swallow never flew (*Pippa Passes*, Introd, fin)

Alice F. Braunlich

Goucher College

---

<sup>3</sup> Duckett (*Catullus in English Poetry*, Smith College Classical Studies, VI, 1925, p 105) has pointed out that "To Constantia Singing" shows the influence of Catullus, LI, which is a translation from Sappho

<sup>4</sup> As Scudder has observed (ed *P U*, p 135), this passage is similar in thought, though not in form, to Aesch., *Prom Bound*, 966-7



EVIDENCE FOR DEFOE'S AUTHORSHIP OF *THE*  
*MEMOIRS OF CAPTAIN CARLETON*

Although *The Memours of Captain Carleton* has been assigned to Defoe at intervals for more than a century,<sup>1</sup> many scholars still question its authorship (chiefly for reasons of style and literary method, such as the relative absence of the characteristic anecdotes which abound in Defoe's representative writings). All the principal biographers of Defoe have cast some doubt on the authorship of this narrative, even so recent and able a study as Professor James Sutherland's concedes no more than that the *Memours* has been "frequently, but not quite conclusively, attributed to Defoe"<sup>2</sup>

In the second volume of *A Tour thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1725), Defoe had made the following observation in his account of Yorkshire

The River *Wharfe* seemed very small, and the Water low, at *Harwood* Bridge, so that I was surprised to see so fine a Bridge over it, and was thinking of the great Bridge at *Madrid* over the *Mansanares*, of which a *Frenchman* of Quality looking upon it, said to the *Spaniards* that were about him, *That the King of Spain ought either to buy them some Water, or they should sell their Bridge*<sup>3</sup>

In the third volume of the same work (1726 or 1727—the date is controversial) Defoe had repeated the anecdote in his account of the bridge over the Clyde at Glasgow.

As for the Bridge, which is a lofty, stately Fabrick, it stood out of the Water as naked as a Skeleton, and look'd somewhat like the Bridge over the *Mansanares*, near *Madrid*, which I mention'd once before, of which a *French* Ambassador told the People the King should either buy them a River, or sell their Bridge<sup>4</sup>

A year or two later we find that the author of *The Memours of Captain Carleton* (1728) used the anecdote even more appropriately with reference to the original river at Madrid

tho' they have what they call a River, to which they give the very fair Name of *la Mansuera*, and over which they have built a curious, long,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. W. Secord, *Studies in the Narrative Method of Defoe* (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, IX, Urbana, 1924)

<sup>2</sup> *Defoe* (London, 1937), p. 268

<sup>3</sup> G. D. H. Cole ed. (London, 1927), II, 618.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 743

and large Stone Bridge, yet is the Course of it, in Summer time especially, mostly dry This gave occasion to that piece of Raillery of a Foreign Ambassador, *That the King would have done wisely to have bought a River, before he built the Bridge*<sup>5</sup>

If the *Memoirs* had appeared first, we would be tempted to assume that Defoe had borrowed this picturesque anecdote when he came to write his *Tour* Instead, we find him remembering it, and using it fluently, two times *before it appeared in its proper context with reference to the bridge near Madrid* Furthermore, Defoe's *Tour* was a work on a very different subject—one which would not conceivably have been consulted by the almost legendary old soldier Carleton, even if he were otherwise capable of preparing his supposed reminiscences of the war in Spain

When William Lee declared that he saw no evidence for Defoe's authorship of the *Memoirs* ("I can find none, external or internal")<sup>6</sup> he had certainly overlooked this highly characteristic anecdote

JOHN ROBERT MOORE

*Indiana University*

### THREE IMITATIONS OF SPENSER

To be added to the list of eighteenth-century sonnets using the Spenserian rhyme scheme is an anonymous one in *The Shamrock or, Hibernian Cresses* (Dublin, 1772) The author of the sonnet was Samuel Whyte, editor of *The Shamrock* and probably author of a considerable part of its contents, but remembered now only as a teacher of Richard Brinsley Sheridan and Thomas Moore In Whyte's *Poems on Various Subjects* (1792, third edition, Dublin, 1795), the sonnet and a few other of Whyte's contributions to *The Shamrock* are reprinted, but there is nothing else of Spenserian interest The sonnet, "To Mr. Thomas Hickey, with Spenser's Fairy Queen," which tells the portrait painter, Hickey, that he should attempt to blend "The Painter's magick Skill, and Poet's Fire," is interesting for its opening reference to Spenser.

<sup>5</sup> First ed (London, 1728), p 305

<sup>6</sup> *Daniel Defoe: His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings* (London, 1869), I, 439

HICKEY, whose faithful Pencil Nature guides,  
 Attend the immortal Strains, sweet SPENSER sings,  
 Whilst on his fiery *Pegasus* he rides,  
 And steers his easy flight with rapid Wings

*The Shamrock*, a volume which has an imposing list of twelve or thirteen hundred subscribers, is a collection of anonymous poetry to which, says Whyte's son, Bell, Pearch, and *The New Foundling Hospital for Wit* were frequently indebted. It has on its title page a motto from Spenser's *Veue*, and contains two Spenserian imitations not noticed by Professor Phelps and others who have written about such imitations "The Temple of Glory, Inscribed to the Meritorious" (28 regular Spenserian stanzas), and "Irene A Canto, On the Peace" (49 regular Spenserian stanzas). There is also an imitation of an imitation, an irregular poem frankly modelled upon and indebted to Bishop Lowth's Spenserian attempt, "The Choice of Hercules," and bearing the same title.

J N Hook

*University of Illinois*

---

### COLERIDGE'S "METRICAL EXPERIMENTS"

In 1912 Ernest Hartley Coleridge published as original poems the eleven "Metrical Experiments" that he found in one of Samuel Taylor Coleridge's manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> The sixteenth- and seventeenth-century-like character of the themes, metre, and diction, however, and S T C's frequent practice of copying into his notebooks poems by earlier writers without indicating their authorship, as in his many quotations from William Cartwright,<sup>2</sup> may well cause one to suspect their originality. At least two of the "Metrical Experiments" are not by Coleridge. "Songs of Shepherds and rustical Roundelays" is a popular seventeenth-century song that is to be found in Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript, *Westminster Drollery* (1672), *Wit and Drollery* (1682), Dryden's *Miscellany* (1716 and 1727), and later in Ritson's *Select Collection of English Songs*

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Poetical Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (Oxford, 1912), 1014-19

<sup>2</sup> See *ibid.*, 996 n

(1785), where Coleridge might well have discovered it "When thy Beauty appears," which Coleridge called "An Experiment for a Metre," is the first stanza of a poem by Thomas Parnell. Such evidence necessarily throws doubt on Coleridge's authorship of any of the "Metrical Experiments" except the first and probably the three headed "Nonsense Verses." It is an interesting comment on Parnell that Professor Saintsbury, believing his poem to be by Coleridge, wrote of it "Very like some late seventeenth-century (Dryden time) motives and a *little* 'Moonish.'"<sup>3</sup>

EARL R. WASSERMAN

*University of Illinois*

# VIER BRIEFE AUS GLEIMS FREUNDESKREISE

Die folgenden Briefe von Gleim, Zimmermann und Ramler sind ungedruckt, soviel ich aus den mir zugänglichen Hilfsquellen feststellen kann. Die Originalhandschriften, deren Text hier genau wiedergegeben wird, befinden sich in meinem Besitz.

## 1. Gleim an Heinrich Christian Boie<sup>1</sup>

Halberstadt den 19ten Dec 1769

Wenn Sie keine Lust haben, mein liebster Herr Boie, zu Berlin<sup>2</sup> zu bleiben, und ich wünschte, beynahe, unpatriotisch genug,<sup>3</sup> daß sie diese Lust nicht hätten, wovon ich jedoch die Ursachen Ihnen hier nicht vorerzählen kan, so kommen Sie geschwind wieder zu uns zurück, nach dem kleinen Halberstadt, und bleiben Sie, so lang' es Ihnen gefällt. Jacobi<sup>4</sup> komt bald wieder, mit Lichtwehr<sup>5</sup> mach ich sie bekant, und Gleim ist ihr

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 1020

<sup>1</sup> Doppelblatt in Oktav, nur mit einem Teil des Wasserzeichens, einer Krone. Am Kopf des Blattes die nachträgliche Bemerkung *ware[?] zu lassen*.

<sup>2</sup> In Begleitung seines Zöglings, des jungen Herrn von der Luhe, war Boie am 21. Dezember 1769 in Berlin angekommen. vgl. Karl Weinhold, *Heinrich Christian Boie*, Halle, 1868, S. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Die Worte *beynahe, unpatriotisch genug*, als Nachtrag am Rande und über der Zeile.

<sup>4</sup> J. G. Jacobi hatte 1768 eine Prabende am Stifte St. Mauritii und Bonifatii in Halberstadt erhalten.

<sup>5</sup> M. G. Lichtwer war seit 1752 Regierungsrat in Halberstadt.

aufrichtiger Freund, was wollen Sie mehr? Wenigstens wünscht ich, daß Sie mit Annehmung irgend einer Stelle sich nicht übereilen, sondern vorher erst beschließen, welche Laufbahn des Glucks sie wählen oder vielmehr welche Art des Lebens von meistem Wehrt auf die längste Zeit in Ihren Augen haben mochte. Unsere Zeit wollen wir hier schon nützlich und angenehm zubringen. Jacobi, der Herausgeber meiner Säckelchen,<sup>6</sup> wurde gern sehen, wenn sie bey diesem Geschäftchen ihm helfen wollten! Jacobi will gern selbst eine Samlung seiner Werke<sup>7</sup> gegen Ostern machen, hatten wir Zeit übrig wir wollten sie gemeinschaftlich nicht unnutze für die Musen verwenden.

Halberst den 24ten Dec 1769

Dies Briefchen, mein wehrtester Herr Boie, sollte auf Ihrer Berlinischen Reise sie einholen, wo nicht ihnen zu vorkommen! Denn es fiel das schlechteste Wetter ein, ich dachte, sie wurden zu Magdeburg Ruhetage nothig gefunden haben, mir war bange für sie, und für ihren jungen Herren, sehr bange war mir. In solchem Wetter? und, auf ofnem Postwagen? Der arme Herr Boie! der arme Herr von der Luhe! Warum nahmen Sie auch im Winter nicht einen zugemachten Wagen? Warum verwahrten sie sich nicht mit Pelzen? Warum sollte der Mentor des Herren von der Luhe mit seinem Telemach um kommen? So dachten, so redten wir von ihnen! Gottlob, daß sie nicht umgekommen, daß sie glücklich angekommen sind! Ein Beweis ihrer Freundschaft, lieber Herr Boie, war es, daß Sie mir bald Nachricht gaben! Denn in Wahrheit ich war Ihrentwegen in großen Sorgen! mehr vielleicht, als ich Ursache hatte, denn Sie sind noch ein junger Hercules, Wind und Wetter ist ihnen nicht so fürchterlich, nicht ihrer Gesundheit so gefährlich, als mir abgelebtem Greiß! Auch für die Nachricht von den ersten ruhigen Stunden dank ich ihnen. Ich freue mich, wenn ich hore, daß es meinem Boie wohlgeht! Herr von der Luhe hätte mir freylich weit mehr gefallen, und vielleicht ich ihm etwas mehr, wenn ich nicht gewußt hätte, daß er mit seinem Mentor, und dieser mit ihm, nicht zufrieden sey<sup>8</sup>. Nicht ohne Vorsatz sagt ich ihm, daß er sich glücklich schätzen muste, von einem Boie, Weisheit und Tugend zu lernen. Ich beklag ihn, wenn er nicht umkehrt, und sie nicht bittet, sein Mentor zu bleiben. Empfehlen Sie mich ihm bestens, und, wenn er umkehrt, so sagen sie ihm, daß ich ihn liebe, wie man einen Herkules liebt, der die Wahl vollendet hat.

O, mein lieber Herr Boie, senden sie mir doch ja mit der ersten Post, unsers großen Mendelssohns<sup>9</sup> kleine Schrift an Lavater! Mich verlangt

<sup>6</sup> Vielleicht Anspielung auf die *Sinngedichte*, Berlin 1769 vgl. *Almanach der deutschen Musen*, 1770, S. 112.

<sup>7</sup> Johann Georg Jacobis *Sämmtliche Werke*, Erster, Zweyter Theil, erschienen 1770 bei Gros in Halberstadt vgl. *Almanach der deutschen Musen*, 1771, S. 65-67.

<sup>8</sup> Vgl. Weinhold, *Boie*, S. 23 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Mendelssohns *Schreiben an den Herrn Diaconus Lavater zu Zurich*, 32 Seiten, Berlin und Stettin, trägt zwar das Datum 1770, muß aber schon

sehr darnach, und ich bin krank, ich schreib ihnen auf dem Bette! Sagen Sie dem großen Lambert,<sup>10</sup> daß der ein H ist, der da behauptet, daß ich in der Apologie fur Amor<sup>11</sup> seiner gespottet<sup>12</sup> habe, sagen sie dem großen Mendelssohn<sup>13</sup> daß der unmöglich sein Freund seyn kan, der mein Gedichtchen an ihn in der A Bibl<sup>14</sup> so wunderlich ausgelegt hat, sagen Sie sich selbst, daß ich Ihr redlicher Freund bin

Gleim     *Endigt*

Ende 1769 erschienen sein vgl den *Anzeiger des Teutschen Merkurs* 1784, Seite cxli "weil nach der Gewohnheit unsrer Buchhandler die meisten Werke die in der Michaelismesse erscheinen die folgende Jahrzahl fuhren"

<sup>10</sup> Joh Heinr Lambert, seit 1764 in Berlin, Mitglied der dortigen Akademie, Verfasser von *Neues Organon oder Gedanken uber die Erforschung und Bezeichnung des Wahren und dessen Unterscheidung vom Irrthum und Schein*, Leipzig, 1764

<sup>11</sup> *Apologie fur Amor* ein Gedicht dieses Titels ist mir nicht bekannt, unterm 29 Nov 1769 (*Briefwechsel zwischen Gleim und Uz*, hrsg von Schuddekopf, Bibl Lit Ver 218, S 390) erwähnt Gleim seine *Schutzschrift fur Amor* Schuddekopf (S 515) bezieht dies auf Gleims Gedicht "An den Herrn Canonicus Jacobi, als ein Criticus wunschte, daß er aus seinen Gedichten den Amor herauslassen möchte Zu Berlin im May 1769" (vgl Goedeke iv 1 86, 38) Die Original Ausgabe dieses Gedichts ist mir unzugänglich, es wurde jedoch im *Almanach der deutschen Musen auf das Jahr 1770 Leipzig*, S 175 182 wieder abgedruckt Eine Stelle, die auf einen Gelehrten wie Lambert gedeutet werden könnte, lautet (S 175 f) ·

Was that, o Freund, dem weisen Mann,  
Dem kleinen Meister Lobesan,  
Der alle Stern am Himmel zahlen,  
Und in den Sternen alle Seelen,  
Und Sonnenstäubchen spalten kann,  
Was that dem Feinde meiner Nymphen,

Was that dem Mann dem Amor doch?  
Mit Zirkel, Winkelmaas, und Spott  
Verfolgt er immer, immer noch,  
Den schönen, kleinen, guten Gott!  
Noch immer seh ich seine Seele  
Voll Groll, in seiner Timonshole  
Laurt er auf ihn! Sein Auge gluht,  
Wie eines Mörders, der den Degen  
Mit Vorsatz, einen zu erlegen,  
Auf Bruder und auf Vater zieht

<sup>12</sup> Anstatt seiner *gespottet* stand ursprünglich *ihn verspottet*

<sup>13</sup> Boie besuchte Mendelssohn bald nach seiner Ankunft vgl Weinhold, *Boie*, S 26

<sup>14</sup> Gemeint ist wohl Nicolais *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* die betreffende Stelle habe ich jedoch nicht gefunden

## Nachtrag am Rande der zweiten Seite

Vergessen sie doch ja nicht den ehrlichen Herrn Grillo<sup>15</sup> zu besuchen!  
und die gute Frau Karschin<sup>16</sup> Ich bin bey beyden in großer Briefschuld!

## Nachtrag am Rande der dritten Seite

Machen Sie mir doch ja keine Entschuldigungen wegen des *Eilfertigen*  
*Briefschreibens* Ich darf sonst ihnen nie wieder schreiben

2 Johann Georg Zimmermann an Gleim<sup>17</sup>

Hannover 27 Dec 1774

Der Überbringer dieses Briefes, mein theurester und hochzuverehrender Herr Canonicus, ist ein junger rechtschaffner Mann, Herr *Ziegler*<sup>18</sup> aus Hannover, der in der Absicht reiset, um seine allbereit sehr beträchtliche Kenntnisse der Naturgeschichte, der Mineralogie, der Landoeconomie, der Mechanik, der Baukunst, und *aller schönen Künste* zu vermehren Reisende dieser Art verdienen Unterstützung wo Sie hinkommen, und diese darf ich mir für Halberstadt von meinem Gleim ausbitten, der gewiß kein größeres Vergnügen in der Welt kennet als jungen Männern von Talenten aufzuhelfen Mir deucht Herr Ziegler sollte für den Herrn Domdechant von Spiegel<sup>19</sup> und den Herrn Domherrn von Rochow,<sup>20</sup> allenfalls auch wenn unser theure Herr Graf von Stolberg in Halberstadt wäre, ein sehr angenehmer und sehr präsentabler Mann seyn, so wie er auch diese Herren zu seinem Zwecke sehr nutzen könnte

Meinen Brief vom 7 Decemb werden Sie erhalten haben, und nach der Antwort sehne ich mich sehr?—Noch muß ich zu diesem Briefe hinzusetzen,

<sup>15</sup> Friedrich Grillo war Professor am Kadettenkorps in Berlin, vgl Weinhold, *Boie*, S 29

<sup>16</sup> Die Karschin hat Boie mehrmals besucht, vgl Weinhold, *Boie*, S 29 31

<sup>17</sup> Doppelblatt in Großquart, die letzte Seite ist weiß, Wasserzeichen mit dem Namen *D & C Blauw*

<sup>18</sup> Vermutlich Christian Ludewig Ziegler, geboren am 5 November 1748, von Meusel (*Gelehrtes Deutschland*, 5 Ausg Lemgo 1800, VIII, 688) als kurhannoverscher Baumeister und Verfasser von Schriften über die Baukunst usw angeführt

<sup>19</sup> Unterm 15 Dez 1776 erwähnt Goecking einen Kammerherrn Freiherr von Spiegel in Halberstadt, unterm 30 März 1780 wird er Domdechant genannt (Strodtmann, *Briefe von und an Burger*, I, 379, III, 11), Gleim hat drei Gedichte an Spiegel gerichtet (Goedeke IV 1 87, 66, 67, 88, 74)

<sup>20</sup> Gemeint ist Friedrich Eberhard von Rochow, geboren 1734, Erbherr auf Rekahn, Prälat zu U L F und Domherr zu Halberstadt (Meusel, *Gelehrtes Deutschland* VI, 389 ff, vgl Goedeke IV 1 511, 17)

daß ich anitzt die Lyrische Blumenlese<sup>21</sup> und die Vorrede<sup>22</sup> (die Ihnen so schmerzhaft gewesene Vorrede) gelesen aber nicht verstanden habe Das Unternehmen des Herrn Rammlers andern Dichtern, auch gegen ihren Willen, ihre Schriften nach seinem Sinne abgeändert herauszugeben, ist so seltsam, um mich des gelindesten Wortes zu bedienen, daß man sich über daher entstandene Streitigkeiten bey dem *genere irritabili vatum*<sup>23</sup> nicht zu verwundern hat In wie fern Sie nun, mein theurester Gleim, in diese Streitigkeiten verwickelt sind, oder diesen oder jenen Stich in der Vorrede vielleicht sich zuziehen da gantz andere Dichter dabey gemeint seyn können, dies bin ich nicht im Stande zu beurtheilen Aber das können Sie versichert seyn, daß mich alles schmerzt, was Ihnen, lieber trauter Freund, wehe thut

Mir deucht ich habe vergessen Ihnen zu sagen wie sehr sich Sultzer der Freude gefreuet hat, die Sie mir letzten Herbst in ihrem Hause, auf dem Wege nach Weingerode, und so lange wir daselbst beysammen waren, gemacht haben

Herder hat ihrer in einem neulichen Briefe an mich uberaus freundschaftlich und liebreich gedacht

Tausend hertzliche Grüsse an die Hälfte ihres Lebens, die liebe und mir unvergeßliche Mademoiselle Gleim Noch ist mir das Andenken ihres Hauses so werth und lebhaft, daß ich alles was darinn lebet und Athem hohlet, (sogar jede Katze, wenn jemand den Auftrag übernehmen wollte) möchte küssen lassen

---

<sup>21</sup> *Lyrische Blumenlese*, Leipzig, bey Weidmanns Erben und Reich, 1774 Der Band enthält die Bücher I-V, denen im Jahre 1778 die Bücher VI-IX folgten, vgl unten den Brief Ramlers an Reich

<sup>22</sup> Der Vorbericht von 14 Seiten ist datiert vom 24 September 1774 Ramler gesteht, daß er eigenmächtige Änderungen in den in die Sammlung aufgenommenen Gedichten gemacht habe "Ob man einzelne Verse, Halbverse und Wörter dem ersten oder dem zweyten Herausgeber [d. h. Ramler] zuzuschreiben hat, ist eigentlich eine sehr gleichgültige Sache Fehler aufzusuchen ist für einen Liebhaber der Dichtkunst nicht die angenehmste Beschäftigung Man hat seinen Zeitgenossen und Freunden gern einen andern Dienst leisten wollen man hat ihre Werke in der Absicht durchgelesen, um ihre Schönheiten zu entdecken, und diejenigen Stücke, die uns am schonsten zu seyn schienen, zur Ehre unsres Landes zu sammeln Hiebey war es aber um so viel nöthiger, nach unserm Vermögen, einige zurückgebliebene Flecken hinwegzunehmen weil die fehlerhaften Stücke nirgends sichtbar hervorstecken, als wann sie neben solchen gesehen werden, die frey von dergleichen Fehlern sind Man hätte diese Sorge den Verfassern selbst überlassen können Viele derselben wußten es sehr wohl, daß einigen ihrer Stücke noch die letzte Feile mangelte Allein sie hatten andre, zum Theil wichtigere Sachen, auszuarbeiten" (Vorbericht S. V IX); welche Stelle im Vorbericht Gleim besonders anstoßig war, ist nicht festzustellen, über Gleims Zwist mit Ramler vgl Goedeke IV 1 183, 68

<sup>23</sup> *genere irritabili vatum* vgl. Horaz Epist. II 2 102



Hertzlich werde ich mich freuen, wenn ich in das Meer von Veignugen, mit dem ich Sie, lieber Gleim, umgeben wunsche, von Zeit zu Zeit auch nur ein Tiöpfchen tragen kann

J G Zimmermann

Meine beste Empfehlung an  
Herrn Jacobi

---

3 K W Ramler an Ph E Reich.<sup>24</sup>

Liebster, bester Freund,

Hier empfangen Sie Ihren Engländer, zu dem ich Ihnen keinen *würdigen* Dolmetscher habe auftreiben und — antreiben können — Sie sollten mehr empfangen, wenn mein alter Professor Ebert<sup>25</sup> mir nicht statt aller Bucher und Schiebereyn waie Nach acht Tagen werde ich ihn nicht mehr sehen, und denn wird es auf die *beiden letzten* neuen Stucke zu dem 2ten Theil der lyrischen Blumenlese losgehen, die ich *Lyrische Blumenlese*<sup>26</sup> VI VII VIII IX Buch benennen werde, damit die *Zahl der Musen* voll werde, die ich nicht überschreiten will Da dieses nur vier Bucher seyn werden, so gebrauchen wir der Vignetten zwey weniger, als das vorige mal Als denn sind keine Lieder der Deutschen<sup>27</sup> mehr Die 57 schlechtesten Stucke dieser alten Sammlung sind nicht allein weggeworfen und an deren Stelle 57 neue Meisterstücke in ihrer Art gewählt worden, sondern die meisten die geblieben sind, haben so viel Verbesserungen erhalten, daß man diese Ausgabe für ein durchaus neues Werk halten kann Es wird, wie ich sehe, 26 Bogen betragen Für den Bogen des ersten Theils gaben sie mir 8 rth, und für den B dieses Th hoffe ich 5 rth mit gutem Gewissen fordern zu können Ich habe ein sauberes Exemplar für die Druckerey verfertigt, das *einer Dame von Stande* so wohl gefällt, daß sie mich ersucht hat, es ihr als ein Andenken von meiner Hand zu lassen, weil es das Verdienst hat, daß man die verworfenen Zeilen und Lieder zugleich ansehen kann Ich mochte also wissen, ob man es wohl aus der Druckerey *unbeschadet* zurück erhalten kann Sonst muß ich noch ein andres für den Setzer fertig

---

<sup>24</sup> Doppelblatt in Großquart, anderthalb Seiten Text, ruckseitig die Adresse *A Monsieur, Monsieur Reich, Libraire tres-célèbre, à Leipzig. Hiebey ein Buch in 4 Heften* Dazu Vermerk des Empfängers 1777 25 Junius Berlin Ramler Wasserzeichen im Falz: Vanden Ley Philip Erasmus Reich war Leiter der Firma Weidmanns Erben und Reich

<sup>25</sup> Johann Arnold Ebert (1723 1795), Professor am Carolinum in Braunschweig, der aber nur zwei Jahre älter als Ramler war, vielleicht wollte Ramler schreiben "mein alter *Freund* Professor Ebert"

<sup>26</sup> Der Band erschien unter dem Titel *Lyrische Blumenlese* VI VII VIII IX Buch Leipzig, bey Weidmanns Erben und Reich 1778, vgl oben Anmerkung 21

<sup>27</sup> *Lieder der Deutschen* Berlin bey G L Winter 1766, (8 unnummerierte und 366 nummerierte Seiten)

machen, und das fruhere fur Ihren Corrector mit schicken — Grußen Sie unsern lieben Freund Weisse,<sup>28</sup> dem ich noch nicht antworten kann Auch Herrn Dyk<sup>29</sup> bitte ich zu sagen, daß er nach acht Tagen einen Brief mit Beylagen durch Herrn Himbürgs Handlung von mir erhalten wird — Das Zweyte Werkchen<sup>30</sup> was ich *ganz im Manuscript* fur Sie habe möchte wohl zur Michaelismesse noch nicht reif seyn Ich verschweige also seinen Namen noch Und nun wunsche ich Ihnen viele ländlichen und häuslichen Freuden, und empfehle mich Ihrem freundschaftlichen Andenken als

Ihr

ewig getreuer

Ramler

Berlin d 21 Jun  
1777

#### 4 Gleim an J H Voß<sup>31</sup>

Halberstadt den 12ten Sept 1784

Wie denn soll ich Ihnen danken, unsterblicher Voß, fur das unendliche Vergnügen, daß Sie mit Ihren vermischten Gedichten<sup>32</sup> mir machten diesen ganzen Sommer! Sie haben mich begleitet uberall, in mein kleines Sans Soucis, auf die Geburge des Harzes, aufs Land! — Herders Ideen,<sup>33</sup> u Zimmermanns Einsamkeit, zwey göttliche Werke, stachen sie aus, zuweilen, nein! machten, daß ich nicht immer sie in Händen hatte — Göttliche Ge

<sup>28</sup> Christian Felix Weisse

<sup>29</sup> J G Dyk, Verleger, Herausgeber der Bibliothek der schonen Wissenschaften

<sup>30</sup> Welches das zweite Werkchen gewesen, ist schwer zu sagen fur 1778 verzeichnet Goedeke (IV 1 181) nur 37) *Cephalus und Prokris, Melodrama*, welches aber in Berlin erschien, und 38) *Kriegsheder fur Josephs und Friedrichs Heere*, o O, 4 Bl 4°, welches kaum in Betracht käme

<sup>31</sup> Doppelblatt in klein Oktav, letzte Seite weiß, Wasserzeichen im Falz eine Art Wappen, mit dem Buchstaben A In der *Vierteljahrschrift fur Literaturgeschichte* VII, 133-136 sind zwei Briefe von Voß an Gleim, vom 24 Juni, 1784, und 28 April 1785, abgedruckt

<sup>32</sup> Da die rechtmäßige Ausgabe von Voßens Gedichten erst 1785 erschien, so muß Gleim die unrechtmäßige Ausgabe benutzt haben J H Voß *vermischte Gedichte und prosaische Aufsätze, Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1784* Dazu stimmt auch der Ausdruck "Ihren vermischten Gedichten" die Ausgabe 1785 hat als Titel *Gedichte von Johann Heinrich Voß Erster Band, Hamburg, 1785*

<sup>33</sup> Der erste Theil von Herders *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* erschien 1784 in Riga, der erste Band von J G Zimmermanns *Über die Einsamkeit*, erschien 1784 in Leipzig

dichte, Voß! O' mocht' ich mocht' ich fliegen können auf einem Luftschiff<sup>34</sup>  
einen Dankkuß Ihnen zu geben, nur einen! aber einen, wie Stolbergs<sup>35</sup>  
Kuß, als Er

Ach! auf die Einzige hin den flammenden Blick heftete!

Ganz etwas anders ist doch den ganzen Dichter zu lesen, als den zer-  
stückelten in den Almanachen, den Blumenlesen,<sup>36</sup> den Stinktopfen—

Dank deswegen auch dir, du Scholar in Gießen,<sup>37</sup> daß du meinen Voß  
gesamlet, und ihn genothigt hast sich selbst zu sammeln!

Hier, mein bester Voß, zehn rth in Golde für zehn Exemplare der bessern  
Sammlung<sup>38</sup>—

Für die übrigbleibenden zehn ggr und das Elfte Exemplar bitt ich mir  
aus ein sauber gebundnes Exemplar in meine Dichter Bibliothek, die nun  
ein eignes habsches Haus hat, und noch zweye für Schmidt<sup>39</sup> und Fischer,<sup>40</sup>  
die ich damit überraschen will, sie sind so gutig von selbst und schreiben  
ihren Nahmen in alle dreye!

Ach! mein Theure! die unsterblichen Stolberge kommen nun wohl nicht  
wieder, sie haben ihr Versprechen über Halberstadt den Rukweg zu nehmen  
wohl nicht halten können! Tausend, und noch Tausend und eine Million  
Umarmungen den Unsterblichen, und ihrer Unsterblichkeit nächsten  
Mitgenossen—

Heiliger Baum, der oft mit Begeisterung meinen geliebten  
Stolberg einsam umrauscht, oft uns vereinigte hier,  
Ihn, Agnes<sup>41</sup> und mich!

Unter diesem Baum, ihr Götter! laßt mich sitzen mit Ihnen und der  
Voßin,<sup>42</sup> eh ich hingehe zu Pyra, Kleist, Musaeus, Lange, Leßing, Sulzer—  
Bodmer—Gott! mein Voß! mein Voß! wie viele sind vorangegangen!

<sup>34</sup> Seit dem Herbst 1783 hatten die Luftschiffahrten der Gebrüder Mont-  
golfier und ihrer Rivalen großes Aufsehen erregt

<sup>35</sup> Den hier zitierten Vers habe ich in den Stolberg'schen Gedichten von  
1779 nicht gefunden

<sup>36</sup> Blumenlesen Anspielung auf Ramlers *Lyrische Blumenlese*, vgl  
Anm 21

<sup>37</sup> Die in Anmerkung 32 erwähnte unrechtmäßige Ausgabe, Frankfurt und  
Leipzig, war tatsächlich bei Krieger in Gießen erschienen

<sup>38</sup> Die bessere Sammlung erschien 1785 im Verzeichnis der Paaennumeranten  
steht "Halberstadt 10 Hr Canon Gleim 10 Exempl" Unterm 28 April  
1785 schreibt Voß "Endlich bekommt Vater Gleim seine Exemplare des  
neuen Versbuchleins" (*Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturgeschichte* VI, 135).

<sup>39</sup> Klamer Eberhard Schmidt (1746-1824) der in Halberstadt lebte

<sup>40</sup> Gottlob Nathanael Fischer, geb 1748, seit 1783 Rektor der Domschule  
in Halberstadt

<sup>41</sup> Agnes von Witzleben, seit dem 11 Juni 1782 mit Friedrich Leopold  
Graf zu Stolberg vermählt

<sup>42</sup> Voß war seit Juni 1777 mit Ernestine, der Schwester Boies, vermählt.

Ebert ist den Unsterblichen nachgereist bis Dresden, u ich hore, sehe nichts von ihm'

Sagen Sie, mein bester Voß, mir doch, wie's ist mit den Unsterblichen und ihren Begleiterinnen—und was sie wissen von Catharina<sup>43</sup> Stolberg'

Ewig

Ihr Gleim

Sehr eilig'

Nachtrag am Rande der 1 Seite

Den herzlichsten Bruderkuß, wenn Gerstenberg<sup>44</sup> bey Ihnen ist' Ob er meine Episteln<sup>45</sup> auch erhalten hat?

W KURRELMAYER

# EIN BRIEF SCHILLERS AN ANTON VON KLEIN

Der hier zum Abdruck kommende Brief ist schon von Jonas<sup>1</sup> (Bd 1, S 188 f, No 105) veröffentlicht Ihm stand jedoch nicht die seit vielen Jahren verschollene Original-Handschrift Schillers zu Verfung, sondern nur der Druck in der *Zeitung* (Jonas schreibt *Zeitschrift*) *fur die elegante Welt*, 1821, No 40, sowie Abschriften von Kuhlmei und Boxberger, die an mehreren Stellen nicht mit einander ubereinstimmten Nun weist die kurzlich in meinen Besitz gekommene Original-Handschrift Schillers noch andere, zum Teil sehr erhebliche Abweichungen auf, die einen Neudruck des Briefes rechtfertigen

Die Handschrift ist ein Quartblatt dunnen weißen Papiers, nur die Halfte des Wasserzeichens, eine Art Krone, ist oben in der Mitte des Blattes erhalten Dieses ist nur einseitig beschrieben

Der von Schiller nicht datierte Brief muß, wie Jonas nachweist, zwischen dem vierten und dem siebten Juni geschrieben sein in

<sup>43</sup> Henriette Katharina, Gräfin zu Stolberg, Schwester der Dichter

<sup>44</sup> Gerstenberg war im Juli, 1784, zum bleibenden Aufenthalt nach Eutin gekommen (*Vierteljahrschrift fur Litteraturgeschichte* vi, 135)

<sup>45</sup> Unterm 24 Juni, 1784, hatte Voß den Empfang der Gleim'schen Episteln (vgl Goedeke iv 1 87, 86) bestätigt Gerstenberg war damals in Lubeck (*Vierteljahrschrift a a O*)

<sup>1</sup> *Schillers Briefe Herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen von Fritz Jonas* Kritische Gesamtausgabe Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, Stuttgart [1892]

dem am 4 Juni geschriebenen Brief No. 104 schlägt Schiller die in unserem Briefe erwähnten Maßnahmen vor, in dem vom 7 Juni datierten Briefe No 106 berichtet er an Dalberg, daß er das Manuscript wieder in Händen habe, und also alles in Ordnung sei

## S T

Eben erhalte ich von H von Dalberg folgenden Einschluß an Sie, und weil ich jetzt gerade zur Unzeit zum Mittagessen wohn engagiert bin, und nicht gleich selbst zu Ihnen kommen kann, so

Der Inhalt des Briefs wird eine Bitte des Barons seyn, ein Msript von mir zurückschicken, das durch seine Übereilung unter andre Papiere kam Sie werden, wenn Sie es gelesen haben, finden, daß Sie Selbst es zwar ohne Anstand lesen, aber nicht mittheilen durften Dalbergs und meine Ideen, die wir kurzlich der T Gesellschaft vortrugen oder vortragen ließen, sind sehr unter unserm Wunsch aufgenommen worden, und mit Mißvergnügen habe ich von Seiten einiger Mitglieder die Bemerkung gemacht, daß alle Institute zur Beforderung der Schönen Litteratur und Kunst wenig Eingang bei Männern finden, die es unter der Würde eines Mannes halten, sich laut für etwas in diesem Fach zu erklären Diese Empfindungen konnte ich wol einem Freunde der Litteratur gestehen, aber es ist natürlich, daß die Art wie ich sie vortrage, für diejenige die sich allenfalls getroffen glauben konnten, zu ektig ist Sie werden also die Gute haben, und das Manuscript entweder mir selbst, oder Dalbergen durch Rennschub zurückgeben Meine Idee zu einem Journal der Gesellschaft wird nie nach meinem Wunsch in Erfüllung gehn, Ich wollte einen grossen Schritt zur Beforderung des Theaters thun, und behalte mir vor, Sie bei einem Plan zu einer Mannheimer Dramaturgie als Freund und quasi Veileger um das Nahere zu fragen Wenn ich allenfalls heute nicht in die T Gesellschaft kommen konnte, so treffe ich Sie doch Morgen, und Wann?

Frid Schiller

Ruckwärts in der oberen rechten Ecke Vermerk des Empfangers.

Manheim Hr Schiller den 9ten Juny—84.

W. KURRELMMEYER

## ALPHONSE DE RAMBERVILLERS, LIGUEUR

On ne connaît presque rien de la jeunesse d'Alphonse de Rambervillers.<sup>1</sup> On sait seulement que, né probablement vers 1560, il avait fait des études de droit civil et canon à l'université de Toulouse, où

<sup>1</sup> Cf sur cet écrivain, E Duvernoy, *Alphonse de Rambervillers et le bailliage de Vic aux XVI<sup>e</sup> et XVII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, dans *Mémoires de la Société d'Archéologie Lorraine*, 1908, E Duvernoy et R Harmand, *Un auteur lorrain Alphonse de Rambervillers*, dans *RHL*, xvii-xviii (1910-11), Ch. Urbain, *Alphonse de Rambervillers, correspondant de Peiresc*, dans *Bulletin du Bibliophile*, 1896.

il avait été camarade de Guillaume du Vair, aux cours du célèbre Roaldès. Il s'était établi ensuite, vers 1587, à Vic en Lorraine, où il exerça pendant toute sa vie le métier d'avocat. Outre *les Dévots élancements du poète chrestien*, qui sont son ouvrage le plus connu, il écrivit un certain nombre d'opuscules latins et français, qui sont tous d'un intérêt plus local, sinon plus réduit.

On ne savait rien sur l'attitude de ce poète lorrain pendant les troubles de la Ligue. On connaissait déjà, depuis 1852, l'épithaphe d'un certain Fouquet de La Routte, gentilhomme dauphinois et gouverneur de la ville de Marsal, qui, s'étant déclaré partisan de la Ligue, avait été tué dans une rencontre. Une plaque de bronze, qui avait dû être apposée à l'endroit même où il avait été tué, nous a conservé les deux épithaphes qui lui furent consacrés, en vers latins et français. Ces vers sont modestement signés des initiales A. D. R. On n'avait pas manqué d'identifier cet anonyme avec notre écrivain, que les initiales semblent désigner assez clairement,<sup>2</sup> malgré les réserves de certains critiques, qui ne considèrent pas cette attribution comme assurée, elle s'impose comme la plus vraisemblable.<sup>3</sup> Il n'y a pas, en effet, un autre écrivain lorrain de l'époque à qui ces initiales puissent s'appliquer.

Quant aux idées qui sont exprimées dans ces vers, elles montrent une parfaite adhésion de l'auteur à la Ligue, du moins autant que l'on peut juger d'après cette composition de circonstance, si réduite et si pauvre en idées. Fouquet de La Routte est exalté et vanté comme un égal des plus grands parmi les anciens, de Trajan et de César par exemple, c'est là une preuve de plus de cet esprit partisan qui illustre toutes les compositions des écrivains de la Ligue. Il peut sembler curieux de le retrouver dans les vers de Rambervillers, dont l'œuvre connue ne contenait aucun autre écrit de cette espèce, mais nous croyons être en mesure de signaler aujourd'hui une autre composition faisant partie de la même inspiration ligueuse, et que l'on peut attribuer, avec autant de vraisemblance, à notre écrivain.

Cet ouvrage est un placard in-folio, pareil à tant d'autres publications de la même catégorie qui parurent du temps de la Ligue

<sup>2</sup> Aug. Digtot, *Note sur [une] inscription qui fait partie du Musée Lorrain*, dans *Journal de la Société d'Archéologie et du Comité du Musée Lorrain*, Septembre 1852, p. 113-121.

<sup>3</sup> E. Duvernoy et R. Harmand, dans *RHL*, xvii (1910), 771 note.

et que nous connaissons grâce au recueil précieux de L'Etoile, intitulé avec tant d'à propos "Les belles figures et droïeries de la Ligue" La publication s'intitule "Histoire abrégée de la vie de Henry de Valois, comprinse en 50 quatrains, propres à tout le peuple françois avec le portraict de Fr Jacques Clément, Religieux de l'Odre S Dominique, qui l'occit le premier jour d'Aoust 1589 Par A D R L" et fut imprimée à Paris, par Pierre Mercier, sans doute dans la même année 1589<sup>4</sup> Pour nous, les initiales sous lesquelles se cache l'auteur de ce pamphlet désignent Alphonse de Rambervillers, Lorrain L'indication de la patrie de l'écrivain, qui est naturelle dans un ouvrage s'adressant à tous les Français, ne figurait pas dans la signature de l'épithaphe citée, et qui était une œuvre purement lorraine

Le placard, imprimé sur quatre colonnes, contient un portrait de Jacques Clément, et commence par un bref récit en prose de son crime Le régicide y est exalté sur un mode auquel nous ont habitués toutes les publications de ce genre Jacques Clément, dont l'entreprise, au dire de l'auteur, "n'étoit en rien moindre que celle de Judith, lors qu'elle tua Holofernes," y est traité de saint, de martyr et de sauveur du peuple françois Rarement les grandes actions furent célébrées dans des termes aussi pompeux, et peu de saints eurent l'heur de se voir attribuer des panégyriques aussi enflammés

O très heureux personnage, par lequel la France pourra désormais vivre en repos' O t'es-saint et religieux homme, qui sans suscitation de personne as voulu librement exposer ta vie à la mort' Hélas' nous sçavons et confessons, très-heureux martyr, combien la France vous est redevable, l'ayant delivrée des cruantez et tyrannie de son vray Pharaon Parquoy je prie Dieu qu'il lui plaise vous mettre avec les bienheureux au royaume de Paradis

La poésie est à la hauteur de la prose, dans cet ouvrage qui déborde de passion. L'écrivain s'adresse à tout le peuple de France Il se propose de lui raconter brièvement, "à celle fin que je ne t'attédie," la vie du tyran qui a été supprimée par le bienheureux moine, afin de montrer

que ce n'est rien d'un roy  
Lequel ne fait ce que la loy demande

---

<sup>4</sup> Le texte du placard est reproduit dans les *Mémoires-journaux de Pierre de L'Etoile*, Paris, Librairie des Bibliophiles 1876, vol iv, p 103-113

L'image de Henri III correspond à ce commencement Il s'est fait coupable de tous les crimes, et sa vie a été un amas de fautes et de turpitude Le poète n'y trouve rien de bon, car dès son plus tendre âge

Il a esté eslevé et nourry  
En tous pechez, et voire en hérésie,  
Qui luy avoit son meschant cœur pourry,  
Et quant et quant son orde âme moisie

Ce prince a toujours été un partisan de l'hérésie, qu'il a encouragée encore plus qu'il ne l'a combattue Le poète sait, par exemple, que lors du siège de La Rochelle, le jeune duc d'Anjou, s'étant laissé acheter par les assiégés, n'avait pas exploité sa victoire ainsi qu'il aurait dû le faire. Il lui fait aussi un crime d'avoir quitté la Pologne "sans mot aucun lui dire," et d'être revenu en France, uniquement "pour la vexer, tourmenter et détruire."

D'un certain point de vue, la composition de ce pamphlet est bien naïve Certes, Henri III n'avait pas été un grand roi, et on aurait pu faire plus d'une critique à ses actes, mais l'auteur, qui écrit pour la troupe fanatisée d'une populace qui ne regardait pas aussi loin, se contente d'observations qui ne sauraient former de véritables accusations à l'adresse du roi disparu Il va même jusqu'à tirer une conclusion défavorable du fait qu'il pleuvait le jour du retour du roi :

Le peuple, hélas ! partout s'esjouissoit  
De son retour et de sa revenue,  
Mais le haut ciel, qui mieux le cognoissoit,  
Pleura longtemps d'une pluye menué

Henri III a, en outre, pris de l'argent à ses sujets, à force d'exactions et de rapines, a poussé aux rangs les plus élevés "je ne sçay quels coqueneaux et béliestres" A un certain moment il voulut tuer beaucoup de catholiques, mais le peuple, devinant ses intentions, se souleva, et ce furent les barricades qui obligèrent le roi à s'enfuir. Il jura alors de se venger, et prépara le crime de Blois Il menaçait ensuite Paris, et déjà les bons bourgeois de la ville commençaient à craindre sa vengeance, lorsque le ciel envoya "ce bon et saint religieux Jacques Clément," qui le tue "avec un glaive et cousteau bien petit" pour une œuvre si grande.

L'auteur n'oublie pas Henri de Navarre, qu'il assure de l'inutilité des efforts qu'il était en train de faire, pour s'assurer le trône



Roy de Navarre, à present tu n'as plus  
 Aucun credit, ny puissance quelconque  
 Tu es matté, tu es foible et perdu  
 Quand est de Roy, tu ne le seras oncques

Il est piquant de se rappeler, en lisant ces vers, que dix ans plus tard, Alphonse de Rambervillers demandait à être présenté à Henri IV, et lui faisait hommage d'un beau manuscrit de ses *Dévots Elancements*. Le temps avait calmé la haine de ce catholique trop fougueux. Pour le moment, il en est encore aux éloges sans fin à l'adresse de Jacques Clément, dont il veut à tout prix faire un saint

Il faut, il faut qu'en un temple honnore  
 Il soit posé avec pompe et grand' gloire,  
 En or, ou bien en cuivre eslaboré,  
 Pour une ferme et durable mémoire,

Et qu'à l'entour de son noble portrait  
 Et de sa claire et luisante effigie  
 Le sculpteur grave avec son meilleur trait  
 Cest Epitaphe et discours de sa vie

VOICY, CHRESTIEN, CE CLEMENT BIEN-HEUREUX,  
 LEQUEL JADIS DELIVRA NOSTRE FRANCE  
 DE CE VALOIS, DERNIER ROY MALHEUREUX  
 QUI TINT SEIZE ANS TOUT LE PEUPLE EN SOUFFRANCE

Les 50 quatrains de cette publication furent refaits, sans doute par l'auteur lui-même, dans une nouvelle édition, publiée dans le même format, sous ce titre "Chanson spirituelle et action de grâces, contenant le discours de la vie et tyrannie de Henry de Valois, et la louange de frère Jacques Clément, qui nous a délivré de la main cruelle de ce tyran, le premier jour d'Aoust, l'an de grâce 1589. Dédicée à tout le peuple catholique de France, par A D R L"

Cette nouvelle composition se chantait sur l'air de la chanson "France réduite en vertu" C'est d'ailleurs pour la faire adaptable à cette mélodie que le poète avait transformé la première forme de son ouvrage écrite d'abord en vers de 10 syllabes, la *Chanson spirituelle* a été réduite à des vers de 8 syllabes, sans que, pour cela, elle ait subi de très grands changements

Ainsi, on découvre dans Alphonse de Rambervillers un des pamphlétaires de la Ligue, un de ces poètes d'occasion dont la passion partisane entretenait le feu de la révolte dans les populations soulevées par des prédicateurs et par des moines Cela n'est pas

très étonnant, car les sentiments catholiques du poète lorrain sont bien connus, sa piété et son horreur de l'hérésie transpirent dans les vers des *Dévots élançements*, aussi bien que dans les lettres que l'on connaît de lui. Le plus étonnant, c'est que ce ligueur à l'âme farouche soit devenu plus tard un adulateur de Henri IV, mais l'âme humaine est toujours la même, et de pareils changements ne sont pas rares, surtout à cette époque de tempêtes civiles et religieuses, qui jetèrent un si grand trouble dans l'esprit de tous les Français.

AL. CIORANESCU

Université de Lyon

# A. FR. *ESCHAREVOTEE 'ÉCORCHÉE'*

Ce participe passé, se trouvant au v 2319 de l'*Ysopet* de Lyon : *Li travail escharevotée li [au cheval] ai sa crope pomelee*, est traduit par W. Foerster 'wund gemacht, geschunden' et rapproché du passage du *Girard de Roussillon* en prose (originaire de Bourgogne, fin du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle) *La terre . fut coverte par dessus des charevostes des morz* (*Rom* VII, 225) avec le substantif *charevoste* 'cadavre.' A. Thomas, *Rom* XXXIX, 212 introduit un *charevate* 'fragments de chair' dans un passage du *Girard de Roussillon* en vers, mal lu par Godefroy *D'os et de charevates corrompus et puans*, et ajoute un *charevais* 'charogne' du roman de *Blaquerne* ainsi qu'un mot du patois de Doubs, dont il dit : "J'ignore l'étymologie" *tchaurvote* 'charogne'. M. J. Jud dans *Studies . . presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope* (Manchester Univ. Press, 1939), p. 227, en recensant les mots dialectaux de l'*Ysopet* de Lyon trahissant l'origine franc-comtoise, voit dans le verbe \**escharevoter* et *charevoste* 'charogne' un CARNE REPOSITA 'viande enfouie' où REPOSERE subirait le traitement -p- > -v- du lyonnais *revondre* 'enfouir, recouvrir.' Mais d'abord un CARNE REPOSITA n'est pas un nexus de mots courant en latin, qui aurait, par conséquent, pu se cristalliser en roman, ensuite l's devant -t- qu'il faut pour l'étymologie n'est attesté qu'une fois dans cette famille de mots, et dans un texte postérieur, nulle trace non plus d'un double -r- CARO REPOSITA et enfin les formes *charevate*, *charevais* ne s'expliquent pas dans cette hypothèse.

Je pense qu'il s'agit d'un reflet de SCARABAEUS, REW<sup>3</sup> 7658:

a fr *esc(h)arbote* 'escaibot, scarabée' (God énumère des passages comme *l'escharbotte / Qui suy le chemin des charrettes, Es estrons des chevaux se boutte et aucunes bestes ont vi pres comme les escarbotes et les mouches*) et le verbe correspondant *esc(h)arbotter* 'éparpiller le feu' (chez Rabelais accouplé à *fouger* et conservé en patois charentais, poitevin et beirichon, cf le prov mod *escarbouta* au même sens),<sup>1</sup> prov mod. *escarava*(i), *escaravach*, *escar(a)bat*, *escarabas* 'escarbot' (*faire l'escarava* 'se poursuivre à quatre pattes, jeu d'enfant'). Le mouvement alerte des six pattes a mené au sens de 'grifonner, faire des pattes de mouche', it *scarabocchiare*, esp *hacer escaravajos* et *escaravajear* 'escarbouiller, barbouiller & gaster comme un papier en jetant de l'encre dessus avec la plume, espapilloter, faire des pasteux en écrivant' (Oudin), de *escaravaço* 'écharbot', prov mod, mallorqu *escarabat* 'grifouillage,' et de là on arrive (cf le rapport étymologique de l'allemand *kratzeln* avec *kratzen*) facilement à 'égratigner, écorcher' \**escharevoter*, dont est dérivé le postverbal (es)*charevotte* 'viande écorchée' > 'fragments de chair,' 'cadavre' (peut-être sous l'influence de *chau*, qui aura fait tomber le *es*—) Ce sens d' 'égratigner' est attesté par le catal *escar(a)botar* 'ferir una cosa superficialment, rozar, desgastar' (*m'he escarabotat un gra, una esgarriuechada*) et *escaravat* 'rabot,' *Dicc Aguiló* Il est moins probable que l'activité "écharbottante" de ces insectes (remuant les étrons et la chair pourrie, cf un des textes a fr cité plus haut et le nom fr de l'échaibot 'fouille-merde' = *scarabaeus stercorarius*)

<sup>1</sup> Est empruntée au fr la famille du catalan (*Dicc Aguiló*) *warbotar* 'moure's, remenar-se un líquid dintre el receptacle, vessar per la part superior' (*porta aquesta ampolla i no warbotis l'aigua*), *warbot(ada)*, *warabascat* (+ *chubasco*) 'xàfec d'aigua, chubasco,' à Empordà ou *warbot*, à Vich ou *escarabotit* 'ou covat sense èxit' (litt l'oeuf dans lequel quelque chose remue, appelé ailleurs ou *batoc*, de 'battre') D'autre part le catalan connaît un *escarabillarse* 'se hàter' et le prov un *escarrabilha* 'animer,' *car(a)vilha* 'chicaner, critiquer' (cf all *sticheln*), formes autoctones que j'ai naguère reconduites (v REW<sup>3</sup>) à SCARABAEUS Le caractère remuant et incertain de la bête semble être reflété par le fourmillement et l'expansion (phonétique, morphologique et sémantique) des formes romanes Le scarabée, comme le papillon, la chauve-souris etc, est de ces bêtes qui transmettent pour ainsi dire leur instabilité à l'homme qui les observe et doit les dénommer Il y a une fermeté d'assiette différente dans l'individu parlant selon qu'il a à faire à des phénomènes ou des êtres qui le 'tranquillisent' ou l' 'énervent' — observation que nous pouvons faire dans la vie courante

*rarius*) ait pu donner au verbe \**escharevoter* l'idée 'fourgonner dans la charogne' et que de là le sens des substantifs 'charogne' se soit établi. Les variantes en *-ate*, *-ans* s'expliquent par le parallélisme phonétique ou suffixal des formes provençales. On notera que les formes franc-comtoises etc (*es*)*charevote*, *charevate*, *charevas* ainsi que les provençales remontent à un *SCARABAEUS* avec *a* intertonique conservé, alors que le fr *écharbot* avec *-rb-* se base sur un \**SCARABAEUS* dissimilé

LEO SPITZER

## ROUSSEAU HERO-WORSHIP

### AN UNPUBLISHED INTIMATE RECORD OF 1766

Sir Robert Liston (1742-1836) was a Scottish linguist, skilled in ten languages, and a successful diplomatist, variously British envoy at Madrid, Stockholm, Washington, the Hague, and Constantinople. His career thus belongs primarily to politics. But in early manhood he touched upon the realm of literature, being taken under the patronage of no less a figure than David Hume, chief intellect of the republic of letters of the mid-eighteenth century. Through Hume's influence, Liston might have become established in the literary realm as Parmese professor of modern languages, but, as it finally turned out to the great disgust of Turgot as well as of Hume, "They will have nothing but a Papist"<sup>1</sup>. Yet it was through Hume that Liston demonstrated that he had the makings of another Boswell—though with the cardinal defect of modesty.

In 1766 the twenty-four year old Robert Liston was residing in Paris as private tutor to Gilbert and Hugh Elliot at the Abbé Choquart's Academy, Barrière St. Dominique. Sir Gilbert Elliot of Minto, the boys' father, not entirely confident that even a brilliant and respected young tutor might not be led astray by the iniquities of Paris, "where," as he imagined, "not to be dissipated is hardly to have an existence,"<sup>2</sup> placed his sons' education and—privately—the tutor himself, under the general supervision of his

<sup>1</sup> Hume, *Letters* (ed J Y T Greig, Oxford, 1932), II, 181.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 499 n

close friend, David Hume Hume, then Chargé d'Affaires at the British legation and reigning lion of the Parisian *salons*, Sir Gilbert argued with reason, would form a bulwark of morality to safeguard both the boys and their preceptor

But to the youthful Liston the reputation of even *le bon David* was aggrandized by his association with the more spectacular Rousseau. Early in January 1766, Hume was preparing to leave Paris, taking Jean-Jacques to England in order to shelter him from the persecutions of the bigots of Geneva. Secretly also the benevolent Hume harbored the intention of securing for his "pupil" a pension from the king of England. The greatness of Hume's heart allowed him as yet no inkling of the viper he was taking to his bosom! It was at this idyllic moment, January 13, that Liston wrote to his sister in Scotland a charmingly guileless account of how he had finally seen his great hero, Rousseau, the previous week, just before he set out for London with Hume. But Liston must be allowed to speak for himself<sup>3</sup>

You perhaps know that the celebrated Monsieur Rousseau, has been obliged to quit Geneva for the religious part of his Emilius, that he has been flying about Switzerland for some time to avoid persecution and assassination, and that he could find no asylum to secure him from the zeal of these *overmuch righteous* pastors, you perhaps know likewise, that, in consequence of an invitation from David Hume, he came here, and is now on his way to England, and that he is to be boarded in a house at Fulham, a village a little way up the river from London. But you surely don't know what I am going to tell you—You know I am a great admirer of Rousseau, and no man has a more irresistible Curiosity to see great men than I. But as all M. Rousseau's former acquaintances crowded to see him, and I had been always told he was the shyest and most misanthropical creature in the world, I did not chuse to ask Mr. Hume to make me acquainted with him. However, for fear he should die before I returned to London, I resolved to see him once before he went away, and with this view went to the Street where he lodged the morning he set off, in order to stare at him as he and David were going into their post chaise. After waiting an hour or two in a Coffee house opposite, I saw Mr. Hume come out and go toward the chair. Now, thought I, now is the time. I run out and got as near the chaise<sup>4</sup> as possible. But behold! no Rousseau appeared.

<sup>3</sup> The National Library of Scotland, Liston Papers, Bundle I. Letter of Robert Liston, Jan 13, 1766, ff 2-3. Though the Liston Papers are not as yet completely catalogued, this letter was made available to me through the kindness of the Librarian, Dr. Henry W. Meikle.

<sup>4</sup> *the chaise* is crossed out.

# MME DESHOULIÈRES'S PARODY OF *LE CID* 451

David observed me, and expressed some surprise at seeing me there I am just come to have a peep at Jean Jacques, says I, I beg you'll not take any notice of me, but let me stare in full liberty—"No no you shall go in and I'll present you to him"—I'd rather not, I've nothing to say to him, and he's so shy "Well, but well perhaps be long before we're ready, you shall at least go in, and sit in an antichamber<sup>5</sup> where you'll see him at [your ea]se"<sup>6</sup> Saying this he pulled me in by the arm I waited in [a]<sup>6</sup> parlour [and when]<sup>6</sup> said famous personage came through carrying out a bundle to his chaise, I made him a low bow which he returned Mr Hume in the inner room, while Rousseau was absent, had told the Countess of Boufflers (a very famous woman and a great protectress of men of learning) that I was in the anti chamber,<sup>5</sup> and my motives for coming She came out immediately, commended my curiosity, made me some compliments, and insisted upon introducing me to Jean Jacques So when he came back she and Mr Hume together presented me to him I can't enter into the particulars of our Conversation,—but upon the whole he received me very well I was about an hour there, saw him dine, and had the Honour to help him into the Chaise He said he would be glad to crack with me when I came to England, &c—His person is very thin & delicate looking, his face, and especially his sharp black Eyes promise every thing he has shown himself possessed of His manners simple and affable If I had more paper I would say more Adieu my Dear—

R Liston

ERNEST C MOSSNER

*Guggenheim Memorial Foundation*

---

## THE DATE OF MME DESHOULIÈRES'S PARODY OF *LE CID*

Among XVII century parodies of drama one of the cleverest is that of the *précieuse* poetess Mme Deshoulières It belongs among the many pieces that used the *stances* of the *Cid* as a vehicle of ridicule and invective Its ample title fully announces the subject to be lampooned. *Parodie de la Scène sixième, de l'Acte premier du Cid de M. Corneille, contenant les Regrets de M. du Perrier, sur le Prix de l'Académie*<sup>1</sup> This is Charles Du Périer, to whose uncle, François, Malherbe addressed the famous lines of his *Consolation* and who was esteemed as a writer of French and Latin verse He

<sup>5</sup> *Sic*

<sup>6</sup> MS damaged

<sup>1</sup> Mme and Mlle Deshoulières, *Œuvres*, Paris, Prault fils, 1753, II, 164 8.

was, in fact, thought of highly enough by Chapelain to be awarded, in 1663, a pension of 800 livres<sup>2</sup>

In 1671 the French Academy created two prize awards, each of 300 l., to be given every second year to the winners of contests in eloquence and in poetry. A subject was announced on which the various contestants would submit an unsigned poem and a sealed envelope bearing their name. Du Périer, together with La Monnoie, won this prize twice consecutively, in the years 1681 and 1683. In 1685 the award was not made, but two years later it went to Mlle Deshoulières for the best ode on *Le soin que le Roi prend de l'éducation de sa Noblesse dans ses Places & dans Saint-Cyr* (*Œuvres*, II, 199-203)<sup>3</sup>. Now it will be noted that the disgruntled poet speaking in the parody says

On ose rejeter des Vers dont je suis pere  
J'attire en murmurant, des Auteurs la colère,  
J'attire leur mépris en ne me vengeance pas  
Falloit il que ma langue, à mon Ode infidelle,  
Fit cabaler contr'elle?

We know then that the poem he submitted to the Academy was an ode. The chances are that its subject was the same as that on which Mlle Deshoulières wrote her winning ode. Elsewhere, Du Périer says

Pension, mon unique amour,  
Qu'on alloit rétablir sans cette tyrannie

That is, he had already received a *pension* (300 l.) and expected to have it renewed by winning the prize a consecutive time. He cannot be referring to the contest that took place in 1685, for that

<sup>2</sup> P. Clément, *Histoire de Colbert*, 1846, p. 188. Born at Aix-en-Provence in the early years of the century, died at Paris, March 28, 1692. According to Michaud, *Biog. univ.*, 1880, he excelled as a writer of Latin poetry. He was known to be excessively vain (cf. *ibid.* and Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. gén.*, 1856-7). It is said that the least aspersion cast upon his writings would immediately provoke a quarrel and alienate his friendship. Legend has it that on one occasion he said to d'Herbelot "Il n'y a que les sots, qui n'estiment pas mes vers." Whereupon d'Herbelot answered that "Stultorum infinitus est numerus." We find listed under his name in the catalogue of the Bibl. Nat. a Provençal poem *Leis Mousquetaires prouvenssaux, a moussu lou chevalié de Fourbin, sonnet*, s. l., 1673, in-4, 1 p.

<sup>3</sup> Pellisson and d'Olivet, *Histoire de l'Académie française*, Paris, Didier, 1858, II, 15.

year, as we have shown, no award was made, moreover, Du Périer's complaint is that it was given to someone else <sup>4</sup> The reference then can only be to 1687, the year when Mlle Deshoulières was chosen as the recipient of the prize money These facts permit us to date the parody *circa* 1687 or soon afterwards Du Périer's vanity must have suffered at the thought that the work of a young girl had been preferred to his own and one can well imagine his voicing criticism of the choice It is not surprising then that Mme Deshoulières should ridicule a man who, though but a few years previously (1684) he had sung her praises in two very insipid "balades," <sup>5</sup> had shown disapproval of her daughter's writings

JOSEPH F PRIVITERA

*Saint Louis University*

---

#### A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF A *JEU DE SCÈNE* IN MOLIÈRE'S *ÉCOLE DES MARIS*

Despois <sup>1</sup> and Martinenche <sup>2</sup> suggest as a source of the *jeu de scène* in Molière's *École des maris*, II, 9, where Isabelle gives her hand to Valère to be kissed, a scene in Lope's *La discreta enamorada*, but there is not a very close parallel In the Spanish, a father is in love with the girl loved by his son, whom she loves The scene referred to, which is in Act II, is as follows The son at his father's command comes to kiss his future stepmother's hand, to do her homage. While he does so, kneeling, amid much flattery which angers the father, he gives the girl a note, she gives him her blessing. While the father's attention is held by her mother, the girl reads the note, learning that the young man is to be sent away. The latter wants to embrace her She tells him that she will pretend to fall and that he can do so as he lifts her up This is carried out.

Compare with this complicated scene the simplicity of the French, where the kiss is given without so much ado "Elle fait semblant d'embrasser Sganarelle, et donne sa main à baiser à Valère."

<sup>4</sup> [Pension] En te donnant

<sup>5</sup> Cf the 1780 (London) edition of her works, pp 747.

<sup>1</sup> *G F F* edition of Molière, II (1875), 341

<sup>2</sup> *RHL*, v (1898), 112



There is another Spanish play in which there is a giving-of-a-kiss, this case seems to me to be closer to the French and a more probable source. In *No hay vida como la honra* by Juan Pérez de Montalbán (published in 1632 in *Para todos*), Leonor gives her hand to her lover, Carlos, to kiss, as she offers an embrace to Fernando, her cousin and *novio*, whom she is meeting for the first time. It is Carlos who brings him to her house and while Carlos is speaking to her about Fernando, she arranges to give him her left hand as she embraces the cousin, an act which is later performed. "Llégase por detrás Carlos, y besa la mano"<sup>8</sup>

One can see that while the general scene does not coincide with the French, there is a close similarity in the method of giving the hand to be kissed. It is to this point that I have wished to call attention.

J. H. PARKER

University of Toronto

---

#### A NOTE ON THE SOURCES OF "VENGANZA CATALANA"

García Gutiérrez had two main sources for his *Venganza catalana* (1864): Francisco de Moncada's *Expedición de los catalanes y aragoneses contra turcos y griegos* and Ramón Muntaner's *Chronica, o descripcio dels fets, e hazanyes del inclyt Rey Don Jaume*. . . . Quotations from both are presented at the end of the printed versions of the play. Since both sources present essentially the same facts, one might wonder as to their relative importance. Six of the nine quotations are from Muntaner, and from him come the names of two characters in the play: Gircón and Perich de Naclara. In Moncada these names appear as George and Pedro de Maclara respectively. The name of Roger de Flor's former ship, "The Falcon" (*Venganza catalana*, Act II, sc. xv) is also taken from Muntaner (Chap cxciv). Moncada does not name it.

However, even apart from the three quotations, it can be definitely shown that García Gutiérrez was at least fairly familiar with Moncada's *Expedición*. In Act I, sc. III of the play reference is made

<sup>8</sup> Act I, in *B. A. E.*, XLV, 481

to Amurat and Carcano, names which are not mentioned by Muntaner. Moncada and García Gutiérrez use both *Alanos* and *Masagetas* for the name of the Massagetae, Muntaner uses only *Alans*. The name Alejo occurs only in Moncada. The names of the other historical characters in the play may have come from either historian. We may further observe that in the first three acts of *Venganza catalana* direct reference is made only to Muntaner, while the three citations from Moncada annotate only the fourth and last act. It is perfectly possible that this may represent the relative importance of the two sources, since there is no historical event (only names of characters and places) in the first three acts which Muntaner might not have furnished, and none in Act iv which might not have come from Moncada.

In general, the spirit of the play, so highly favorable to Roger and to his supposedly Spanish followers, is closer to Muntaner than to Moncada, for the latter displays greater poise and less patriotic partiality. It is not our purpose in this note to comment upon García Gutiérrez's distortion of history to suit his own artistic ends.

N. B. ADAMS  
W. C. SALLEY

*University of North Carolina*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude.* By J. E. BERNARD, JR.  
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939. Pp. xii + 228.  
\$3.00

*Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Catholic Church in "King John."* By GERARD M. GREENEWALD. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1938. Pp. x + 195. \$1.50

*The Warde.* By THOMAS NEALE. Edited by JOHN ARTHUR MITCHELL. Philadelphia, 1937. Pp. viii + 100.

*The Invisible World: A Study of Pneumatology in Elizabethan Drama.* By ROBERT HUNTER WEST. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1939. Pp. xvii + 278.

- Das Bild Sir Philip Sidneys in der Englischen Renaissance.* By BERTA SIEBECK Weimar Hermann Bohlau, 1939 Pp xvi + 198
- Shakespeare Personliches aus Welt und Werk* By ROBERT WOLLENBERG Berlin Dr. Emil Ebeiling, 1939 Pp 140
- The Fourth Forge: William Ireland and the Shakespeare Papers* By JOHN MAIR New York Macmillan, 1939 Pp xvi + 244 \$2 75
- Five Elizabethan Tragedies* Edited by A K MCILWRAITH New York Oxford University Press, 1938 Pp xx + 400 \$ 80
- Shakespeare Studies Macbeth.* By BLANCHIE COLES New York Richard R Smith, 1938 Pp xiv + 290 \$2 50
- Die Zusätze zur "Spanish Tragedy."* By LEVIN L SCHUCKING Leipzig S Hirzel, 1938. Pp. 82 RM 3
- The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero* By LEVIN LUDWIG SCHUCKING New York Oxford University Press, 1938 Pp 29 \$ 60
- The Jacobean Shakespeare and Measure for Measure* By R W CHAMBERS New York Oxford University Press, 1939 Pp 60 \$1 50
- Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa.* By WILHELM FRANZ Halle Max Niemeyer, 1939. Pp. xl + 730 RM 26.
- Shakespeare Criticism An Essay in Synthesis* By C. NARAYANA MENON New York Oxford University Press, 1938 Pp viii + 276 \$1 75
- Shakespeare.* By MARK VAN DOREN New York Holt, 1939 Pp. viii + 344 \$3 00.
- Studies in Metaphysical Poetry* By THEODORE SPENCER and MARK VAN DOREN New York Columbia University Press, 1939 Pp viii + 88 \$1 50.
- Elizabethan and Jacobean Playwrights.* By HENRY W. WELLS New York Columbia University Press, 1939 Pp. xiv + 328. \$2 75.

A "telegraphic" review upon materials from an editorial grab-bag may as well begin at the beginning, with the grubbers around the foundations of knowledge, and examine the doctoral dissertations.

Dr. Bernard (Yale) analyzes the prosody of seventy-two items classified as Tudor Interludes. There is a great deal of calling

things what they are not, but the assigned nomenclature is used consistently with itself, so that the bulk of the work is at least systematic—we can hardly speak of any system of prosody yet as scientific. He could easily have improved the chronology, by examining Professor Reed's dating of *Four Elements*, Dr Pollard's of Heywood's *Weather*, etc. His own researches, however, have been thoroughly and competently done. He finds that in general the playwrights attempted to vary "their verse in accord with what took place in the drama." But prose and blank verse supplanted these devices at the end of the sixteenth century. Prosodic habits perhaps shed some light on questions of attributed authorship for certain plays. This is an able doctoral dissertation.

Next is the dissertation of "Rev Gerard M. Greenewald, O. M. Cap., M. A., S. T. B." (Catholic University of America). "Some critics interpret *King John* according to the prevalent religious and political attitude of their own day—to say nothing of their own personal prejudices. Now, in this study of the play the method pursued is, of course, purely objective"—(anything but). The author mistakes the equivalent of "surreverence" for a "curt apology" and recognition of the Pope's spiritual supremacy by King John, and upon that foundation builds high. Frankly, the author exhibits no technical training in literature whatever, and little first-hand reading in Shakspeare or the period, not even Roman Catholic source materials. The full parallel between the curse pronounced on Shakspeare's John and the actual one pronounced on Queen Elizabeth may be of interest.

Dr Mitchell (Pennsylvania) says, "The purpose of this thesis is to edit for the first time the manuscript play, *The Warde*, by Thomas Neale. In this introduction will be found an account of the life of Thomas Neale, an account of his other writings, extant and lost, a discussion of *The Warde*, its plot and its relation to the drama of the period, and a consideration of the text and its problems." The author is interested chiefly in the autobiographical aspects of the play, taking some three-fourths of his preface for this phase, but at that overlooking the major fact that the court of wards was under fire at this period. He catches an explicit allusion to Iago and Roderigo, but fails to recognize the bear Sackerson, hence the relationship between Simple and Slender. The actual work of editing has been rather perfunctorily and superficially done. Even if we should consider this a passable doctoral dissertation, still we may question whether it should have been put into print before it was a great deal more.

So Dr. Bernard well sustains the tradition set by his elders at Yale, Dr. Mitchell is "o'erparted", and the other specimen is not what is ordinarily considered a doctoral dissertation at all.

In a second group of six, we turn next to the work of Mr West, which has the air of having once been a doctoral dissertation. The first quarter is devoted to "The Literature and Background of

Sixteenth Century Pneumatology," being an excellent presentation of terms and controversies in sixteenth-century pneumatology. The author then passes selected bits of guinea-pig plays through the sausage-grinder of systematic pneumatology to be ground exceeding small—it is a good sausage-grinder—and they stay ground! There are no summaries of results either for the chapters or for the study as a whole, but it becomes clear that sixteenth-century plays can have little direct connection with the systematic—not scientific!—pneumatologists.

Says Miss Siebeck, "Die Aufgabe dieser Arbeit ist es, den Ruhm Sidneys in der englischen Renaissance in seiner Entstehung, Eigenart und Wirkung zu untersuchen." Here is presented the Renaissance Paradise, "eine griechische Wiedergeburt," with "Puritanismus, der eigentliche Zerstörer der Renaissance" playing the devil with it all, including "das Bild Sidneys." In spite of this pre-"possessed" ideology, the copious materials can be made to speak for themselves, especially those on Mary Pembroke's circle, and to give an excellent idea both of what Sidney meant to his contemporaries and of how he came to mean that. One wishes that both Mr. West and Miss Siebeck had worked from facts to theories.

Another study in German, by Robert Wollenberg, "Doktor der Medizin und Professor der Psychiatrie," on *Shakespeare Personliches* does attempt to begin from the facts, but is merely a layman's compilation (his technical training hardly shows).

Mr. Mair's *Fourth Forger* deals too popularly and satirically for truth with Ireland's Shakspeare forgeries. As soon as Shakspeare scholars, and actors, actually got access to the materials, the verdict was not in doubt. The same kind of "authority" was deceived then, as now annually by genuine signatures, "scientific" proofs from alleged faked portraits of Oxford, etc., though Mr. Mair does not suspect it.

We notice next a couple of textbooks. Mr. McIlwraith prints, and adapts from standard editions matter upon, *Thyestes* (Heywood's translation), *Gorboduc*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Arden of Feversham*, and *A Woman Killed with Kindness*. This is a conservative summary on early tragedy, from conservative sources, which are now usually in need of some modernizing.

Mrs. Coles says of her *Macbeth*, "The intention has been to present, for the student and the serious reader, a supplementary manual to be used with Shakespeare's text. All the lines of the play have been paraphrased, the major problems of the drama have been considered, and the several viewpoints of recognized commentators quoted in brief. The study of character is again the motif of the work," as in her *Hamlet*. Some will not care to gossip over the back fence about Renaissance stage characters as "living people", others may deny that there is any pedagogical place for such a commentary. The work has been done with such conscious

and perfect propriety that it might be used with safety in a Victorian seminary for young ladies. They would never know even about the "shard-born beetle"—Mrs Coles doesn't—, unless in an unguarded moment they should happen to look it up in the *Oxford English Dictionary*. One gets the impression that Shakspeare had examined with unwonted diligence the *Fuiness Variorum* of *Macbeth*—as, of course, he *ought* to have done. And that his selections of materials were, for him, remarkably unElizabethan.

For the six items in this second group, as for the three dissertations, at least two-thirds of the printing space could have been saved. The remaining eight items of the elders in our third group could profitably be cut at least in half. It is obvious where the fault lies for congested "scholarly" publication.

Our third class consists of Shakspearean criticism and closely allied work. Professor Schucking asks concerning *The Spanish Tragedy*, "Sind die 'additions' in der Tat Erweiterungen des ursprünglichen Stuckes, oder stellen sie nicht—zum mindesten in ihrer Mehrzahl—einen Ersatz von Teilen dar, die man aus irgendwelchen Gründen ausschalten wollte?" He argues that they are substitutions, first because they would make the play too long, not realizing that all plays were more or less cut and adapted for acting, second because of their nature in fitting the play to a newer taste, though such changes might as well be additions as substitutions. Not even his best illustration is a wholly satisfactory substitute, as he himself later admits in trying to substantiate a different theory. The other cases are even more amusing attempts to force facts to fit a theory. Because of supposed relationships to other plays, the additions are dated January, 1597, and on psychological grounds assigned to one individual for one occasion. Three endings are discovered for the play, and a fourth added in a footnote, on the same principles, there can be more, if desired. There are various general conclusions concerning the proper ordering of the text, based on the previous conclusions, which are based fundamentally on Professor Schucking's impressions only.

In his Shakspeare lecture, Professor Schucking asks, "is not a certain literary taste which he shared with his time to be observed in his writings, and would not the perception of the characteristic traits of this taste help us to a better understanding of his work?"; a taste which he labels baroque. He objects that the real aim of tragedy is usually stated in classical terms, whereas that real aim was sensation. Instead of the mirror passage in *Hamlet* he would substitute another, which he does not know is from Quintilian, and a statement of Drayton's, which rests on Horace, though again he does not appear to know. Elizabethan tragedy was born of Senecan tragedy, interpreted in terms of the Latin masters of oratory, Cicero and Quintilian, and of Horace, the great theorist on poetical excellence. This was purest grammar-school Renaissance; there is no need for such an extraneous cacophany as baroque. In both

these items, Professor Schucking makes many interesting observations, but one wishes he would derive his theories from his facts instead of finding facts to substantiate theories.

In all these respects, the Shakspeare lecture of Professor R W Chambers on *Measure for Measure* is a model. Underlying the work of Stopford Brooke and Dowden is the fallacious assumption that the plays of Shakspeare reflect his actual moods, and those who have been reared on those texts find it difficult to disabuse themselves of it. The first half of this lecture most charmingly demolishes that assumption, as a necessary preliminary to considering *Measure for Measure*, which has suffered so much from it. On the matter of tragedy before the tragic period, Professor Chambers might have pointed out also that in 1598 Francis Meres found six tragedies to balance against six comedies. The second half of the lecture considers *Measure for Measure* without conditioning pre-suppositions. No summary is possible, and if it were, the reviewer would not give it. For he would not deprive the reader of the benediction of a great spirit, which he must not fail to seek in the lecture itself. If there has been a greater piece of Shakspearean criticism since Bradley, the reviewer does not recall it. (Incidentally, the reviewer does not agree fully with either of them.) This is the true historical and human method, in the hands of a very great master, personally as well as technically.

One need only mention the fourth edition of the *Shakespeare-Grammatik*, by Professor Wilhelm Franz of Tübingen, which first appeared in 1898-9. Changes and additions for the second and third editions have in this edition been fully incorporated in the text, American speech has upon occasion been considered, and the section on metrics has been reshaped.

So far, we have been considering the works of those who at least pretend to be objective in the bases of their judgments, and usually attempt to proceed from fact to judgment. Not so the work of Professor C Narayana Menon of Benares Hindu University. Developing a theory of literary criticism from mystical Indian philosophy, he applies it to pieces and patches of Shakspeare. He stresses the subjective reaction with his philosophic impressionism as much as we with our mechanistic view stress the objective fact which occasions the subjective reaction. But Professor Menon devotes about half as much space to compact notes and bibliography covering a great proportion of outstanding and recent contributions on the subject, as he does to text. Work so founded may be philosophically impressionistic, but one who has been so thoroughly prepared is likely to be impressed very much like any other thorough scholar. Because Professor Menon is an Indian, his subjective impressions are interestingly different—which he would deny, no doubt.

Presumably we are also to consider Professor Mark Van Doren's *Shakespeare* either as a critical work or as a textbook. The author

lays down no critical principles, but says, "Anyone at all will see that my favorite among the older critics is Dr Johnson." What we are offered is a personally conducted tour through Shakspeare by "a poet in his own right." As nearly as the reviewer can make out from "spotting" through, only a comparatively small part of the works of Shakspeare was written by "a poet" or "the poet," and these bits of real poetry Professor Van Doren proposes to point out, the drossy remainder is left to the biographer, historian, etc. There is no disputing about tastes, but the reviewer is glad he is not a poet-critic, there would then be so much in Shakspeare that he would not be permitted to enjoy. (After all, aren't these merely lecture notes handed down ex-cathedra to impress undergraduates?)

A pamphlet by Professors Spencer and Van Doren is the result of a happy thought on the part of the Seventeenth Century Section of the M L A in inviting them "to present a survey and analysis of the scholarly and critical work which has been done on metaphysical poetry during the past twenty-five years," some reviews excepted. The useful bibliography of metaphysical poetry as they define it was done by Professor Spencer, "With the assistance of Evelyn Orr." The professors then parted scholarship and criticism between them for introductory essays, despite the fact, as Professor Spencer as scholar complains, that no such division is in fact possible. Both felt compelled to be more or less "contemporaneous" in their estimate of metaphysical poetry, especially Professor Van Doren. With one eye on his contemporaneity and the other on the "critic," Mr T S Eliot, he makes a capital Y out of the resulting dilemma, thus getting three horns instead of the conventional two on which to gore contemporaneity (pseudo-seventeenth century style) to little bits spread all over the intermediate points—apparently that Y is also well-studded with spikes. Scholars will find the bibliography useful, if critics be other than scholars, to them the reviewer does not presume to speak.

Like his colleague with the lacerated contemporaneity, Professor Wells thinks, "Samuel Johnson's Preface to his *Shakespeare* remains probably the finest critical essay." His own "book as a whole analyzes major tendencies in the drama from 1576 to 1642." My treatment has been critical, not chronological. . . it represents no new research." The work is hard to follow, since thought and structure from sentence up need a sharpening of focus. As the author himself indicates, he groups selected plays in such a way as to bring out the chosen theme of each of twelve essays. Not only does he regroup, but he also uses terms in his own sense. By this juggling with terms, the final chapter of conclusions systematically thrusts the Hell of the Middle Ages into the Elysium of the Renaissance. Having performed this feat, the author then eliminates the Renaissance altogether. It was merely a "curious poise or equilibrium between medieval and modern influences," which was broken in 1611, when Shakspeare retired. To place "the water-



shed between the two movements" at Shakspeare's retirement is to overlook what happened to Shakspeare himself in his final period, as the late Professor Thorndike would have admonished his junior colleague. There is never any watershed in literary movements, they are not that simple. No amount of essaying upon objective materials rearranged according to subjective impressions will change that fact. It is the same kind of fallacy which Professor Chambers destroys for Stopford Brooke and Dowden.

Thus our three self-confessed critics all claim overtly or tacitly subjective standards, though Professor Menon claims a philosophic impressionism tested by the outstanding works in the field. Such a subjectivity is at least cognizant of objective facts. The reviewer prefers the school of Bradley, so ably illustrated in our group of works by the lecture of Professor R. W. Chambers. There all the objective facts—historical, chronological, textual, etc.—meet in a great personality to produce a subjectivity tuned to understand the master. And emotional understanding is all. All in all.

T. W. BALDWIN

*University of Illinois*

---

*The Passionate Pilgrim by William Shakespeare.* Reproduced in facsimile from the unique copy in the Folger Shakespeare Library, with an Introduction by JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. New York and London. For the Trustees of Amherst College, Charles Scribners' Sons, 1939. Pp. lxvi + sigs. A1-D8. \$4 00.

Dr Adams and all concerned in the administration of the Folger Shakespeare Library have placed students under a deep debt of gratitude for this remarkably thorough and scholarly work. It is no small thing to have an excellent collotype reproduction of the strange and in part unique copy of the well-known Shakespearean miscellany that forms part of the wonderful little volume discovered twenty years ago in the muniment room at Longner Hall. It is an added blessing to have an introduction of over sixty pages in which Dr Adams discusses every aspect of the problems that cluster round it. One can have nothing but admiration for the way in which these problems have been attacked and solved by Dr Adams and his staff.

The book is a composite one, being made up of sheets derived from two different editions, one the edition formerly regarded as the first, the other an edition now recognized as being yet earlier. The proof of this Dr Adams sets out in the form of a conjectural account of how the volume assumed its present form. Whether all the details of this reconstruction are correct, it is, of course, impossible to say, but of the central fact of priority there can be no

doubt. The short proof is this. In what is now claimed as the first edition (of which unique copies of sheets A and C survive in the Folger volume) each several poem begins a fresh recto page. Since most of the poems do not exceed one page in length, this means that most of the versos are blank, though a few longer poems run through several consecutive pages (rectos and versos). The absence, however, of any headings or numbering to the poems makes the arrangement obscure, and it was clearly not understood by the compositor of what is now recognized as the second edition, who set up the matter on recto pages only, except where towards the end he had to crowd it for lack of space. There are, of course, subsidiary arguments that confirm this conclusion, including some interesting textual points, but there would in any case be no escaping the implication of the bibliographical evidence.

The whole of the rather disreputable history of this famous miscellany comes in for lucid discussion, and points with irony the fact that within twenty-five years of his piratical assault William Jaggard had established his reputation for all time as mainly responsible for the authorized collection of Shakespeare's plays. The individual poems of *The Passionate Pilgrim* are drawn from many different sources. They no doubt for the most part constituted the commonplace-book of some literary amateur of the time, the type of collection of which many examples still survive. There are several in the Folger Library containing variant versions of poems in the *Pilgrim*—the most interesting belonged about 1600 to 'Anne Cornwaleys,' probably the daughter of Sir William Cornwallis of Brome Hall, who ten years later became Countess of Argyll. These alternative versions are duly printed at the end of the introduction.

Dr Adams and his assistants have done their work with such minute and loving care that hardly any points of detail invite comment, still less criticism. Only one or two observations suggest themselves.

In the second edition of *The Passionate Pilgrim* stanzas 3-4 and 5-6 of poem XVIII are transposed. This means the interchange of the type of D2 and D3 (rectos). 'It may be that the error arose in the course of imposition,' Dr Adams writes, and he quotes Moxon to the effect that 'It sometimes chanceth that a Compositor

Transposes two Pages' (p. xlv). There can be little doubt that it is an error of imposition: the alternative would be a transposition of C5 verso and C6 recto in the copy of the first edition from which it was printed, which seems out of the question. But the usual error of the kind, of which Moxon was probably thinking, is the interchange of two adjacent pages in the same forme. It should be observed that here we have to do with the interchange of opposite corner pages in opposite formes, a much stranger error.

In the first edition, and in the latter half of the second, the leaves are not signed beyond the first of each quire. It was this, of course,

that allowed the transposition just mentioned to escape detection Dr Adams remarks that 'The compositor, it would seem, thought that in so small a pamphlet the signing of the quires alone would be adequate' (p. xlvi). I do not see that the size of the book is relevant. However many the quires, the signing of the first leaf of each is sufficient to ensure their correct order; the signing of the other leaves is a safeguard against incorrect folding, or perfecting, or imposition, accidents which occur within the quires and are independent of their number.

By a curious slip on p. xxii (note 3) Mr Harry Farr, the Cardiff Librarian, appears as Henry Fair.

I should like to close with a further expression of gratitude for a very delightful volume.

W. W. GREG

*London, England*

*The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth: The Later Years.* Edited by ERNEST DE SELINCOURT. OXFORD: The Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford University Press], 1939. 3 vols., xxxviii + 1408 pp. \$21.00.

Another of Professor De Selincourt's numerous and important contributions to scholarship is now concluded. The six volumes of Wordsworth correspondence extending to almost 3000 pages include 1710 letters and if to these are added the 137, which are not here reprinted, in the Crabb Robinson and in the Henry Reed volumes the total reaches 1847.<sup>1</sup> As might be expected, these final volumes are the least interesting and least significant of the whole. Dorothy was ill much of the time and the poet usually wrote on business or family affairs, to thank authors for the gift of their books, to raise money to erect a second church in Cockermouth, to urge extending the period of copyright, or to lament the sad condition of the times. Many of the letters are, indeed, disheartening. Wordsworth's bitter hostility to the Reform Bill, to the Catholic Relief Bill, to universal suffrage, to non-conformity, to the extension of the railroad into the lake district, his dislike of France, his loss of faith in democracy and his distrust of all change suggest the contracting sympathies, the hardening prejudices of an old age more often gloomy than serene or mellow. It is painful to read such sentences as these:

<sup>1</sup> Edith Morley's *Correspondence of C. R. with the Wordsworth Circle* includes 118 letters from the poet or his sister but, as two of these are incomplete, they are here given in full. Broughton's *Wordsworth and Reed* has 22 letters from Wordsworth, one of which is here given in full. Professor de Selincourt says (p. v) that these last volumes contain 1044 letters, I make 1054, of which 4 were incompletely published in earlier volumes of this edition.

In all the *improvements* now going forward [in colleges] a main motive is to acquire influence for political purposes. Medical education is clearly cheap enough. We have far more doctors than can find patients to live by. The better able the parents are to incur expense, the stronger pledge have we of their children being above meanness, and unfeeling and sordid habits. As to teaching Belles Lettres, Languages, Law, Political Economy, Morals, etc., by lectures, it is absurd.<sup>2</sup>

The letters from Italy, the greater part of which have not been printed before, are likewise distressing reading for those of us who admire the poet. They are filled with complaints of discomforts and inconveniences—fatigue, heat, loneliness, pains and minor illnesses, disappointment in not receiving letters, criticism of his companion (Crabb Robinson), and of his family for offering good advice. All travellers have anxieties and difficulties but most of us, if we mention them at all, make light of them in order to give pleasure, not concern, to our friends. Wordsworth seemed to think only of himself. The general tameness of his letters is due in part to this same cause, his unwillingness or inability to make an effort to be pleasing. When he exerted himself, as in some of his correspondence with Miss Fenwick or when he was roused by interest in a subject, he could write well.

The poet was himself conscious of his faults. In two of the many interesting letters to Miss Fenwick, which are here published for the first time, he wrote: "What I lament most is that the spirituality of my Nature does not expand and rise the nearer I approach the grave. . . no kind of reading interests me as it used to do, and I feel that I am becoming daily a much less instructive Companion to others." "Only assure me that you will not judge of my faults and infirmities so severely. . . I will *endeavour to mend*. . . I am too conscious my dear Friend that I am unworthy of being always in your sight."<sup>3</sup> Seldom did Wordsworth express himself as freely as this, more often he was formal and pedestrian when he should have been spontaneous and friendly. Except with his family he seems to have found it hard to express the kindness that he undoubtedly felt, and in consequence the letters give an inadequate and misleading picture of the man. It is clear from his actions and from the testimony of those who knew him well that he was a more interesting, a more admirable, and a more likable person than these volumes would lead one to suppose. As Crabb Robinson wrote in his diary for November 20, 1820, "he is a still man when he does enjoy himself and by no means ready to talk of his pleasure."

<sup>2</sup> Letter to Lord Lonsdale of June, 1825. In a letter to his wife of July 17, 1837, he wrote: "How often have I wished for James to assist me about the carriage for nothing can exceed the stupidity of these foreigners."

<sup>3</sup> Letters to Miss Fenwick of September 19, 1844 and September October, 1844. In a letter to his family of July 5, 1837, he spoke contritely of his harshness and "all my unworthiness."

It is hardly necessary to add that these hundreds of pages of previously unpublished material together with the corrections to the text and the dates of what has previously been published offer much that is invaluable to the student of Wordsworth. Aside from the light they throw on the poet's personality, opinions, literary tastes and theories, they are essential to any understanding of his later years,—the importance that eye-trouble played in his life, his absorption in his family and then health, the fading of his intimacy with old friends and the coming of new, who were commonly persons of wealth or of position, and the loss of joy, which is mentioned so early as 1798 (in "Tintern Abbey") and is the subject of much of his verse. It is unfortunate that Professor de Selincourt has been unable to see and thus to print correctly and in full many of the letters Knight published only thirty-two years ago. As forty-three letters have turned up while this edition was passing through the press, more will certainly be found. Several noteworthy letters from the early years are printed for the first time in the appendix to these volumes. One gives us Wordsworth's early impressions of Coleridge and Southey, another shows that Hazlitt's misconduct in the north was apparently not the cause of his quarrel with the lake poets, one praises Keats and another Crabbe. The index covers only the last three volumes, is limited chiefly to proper names, and is not always complete for these.

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

*The Life of S. T. Coleridge: The Early Years* By LAWRENCE HANSON. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. 575. \$5 00.

*Wordsworth and Coleridge: Studies in Honor of George McLean Harper* Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939. Pp. viii + 254. \$4 00.

It is inevitable that Mr. Hanson's biography of Coleridge should be compared with that of Sir Edmund Chambers, which preceded it by a mere matter of weeks. Again and again, in reading Chambers, one felt that an adequate account of Coleridge was simply impossible within so limited a space, and that, although the book was strictly confined to biographical facts, its compression, however masterly it might be, not only precluded full discussion of certain events, but ran the constant risk of false emphasis and consequent lack of proportion.

Mr. Hanson's *Life* is on a larger scale, and he uses an amplitude which Chambers denied himself. The present volume of 575 pages

stops short on June 12, 1800, the day on which Coleridge left Stowey with his family to settle at Greta Hall. He was then barely 28 years old, and, although he had written nearly all the poetry by which he is remembered, the remaining thirty-four years of his life contain plenty to interest a biographer. The tragic story of the decline of his powers and of his struggles against opium is in many ways more fascinating than that of his youthful enthusiasms and indiscretions in the days before his intimacy with Wordsworth began, and the Highgate period, more serene and less eventful, has yet to be fully described. Two, or even three, more volumes will be necessary for the completion of Mr. Hanson's task.

Mr. Hanson's plan rightly includes a consideration of Coleridge's intellectual activities, and of the influences which stimulated his contributions to poetry, criticism, and philosophy. To many chapters 6 and 7, on Wordsworth and his early relations with Coleridge, will prove the most interesting. Coleridge himself divided all thinkers into Platonists and Aristotelians, and scholars, as Lowes once suggested, seem similarly to be divided into Wordsworthians and Coleridgeans. Mr. Hanson, it need scarcely be said, is on the side of his hero, and it cannot be expected that the Wordsworthians will agree with everything that he says about the extent of Coleridge's influence on Wordsworth. But though they may disagree they cannot complain, they have had their way for too long, and we have looked at Coleridge's character through their eyes for the better part of fifty years.

Mr. Hanson has many qualities that are excellent in a biographer, and it is to be hoped that he will persevere with his task. He writes with distinction but, whenever possible, he allows Coleridge to speak for himself, and the unobtrusive skill with which Coleridge's character is gradually unfolded is one of the most attractive features of the book. The pace is leisurely, too leisurely perhaps, and one sometimes thinks regretfully of Chambers's terseness and precision. It must be admitted, too, that the account in chapter 10 of the influence on Coleridge of the eighteenth century philosophers, especially of Hartley, is in such general terms as to make one wonder (quite unjustly, I have no doubt) whether Mr. Hanson has read them all, and it is difficult to feel that the criticisms of *The Ancient Mariner*, *Christabel*, and *Kubla Khan* (pp. 253-261) add anything to what has already been said about these poems.

Mr. Hanson is a safe enough guide over much difficult and thorny ground, but it would be unwise to follow him implicitly when he sets out to scale the heights. Further, his sense of the proper marshalling of facts and evidence deserts him occasionally, and in the very places where skill and caution are most necessary. The unexpectedly dogmatic statement that *Christabel*, though "begun after, [was] finished before *The Ancient Mariner*" (p. 256) has, it is true, a footnote, but it cannot be said that the authorities there

referred to justify the assertion. Only when the authorities cited by his authorities have been investigated does it appear that he is proceeding on the exceedingly doubtful assumption that Coleridge alluded to *Christabel* when he wrote to Cottle on February 18, 1798. "I have finished my ballad—it is 340 lines" Elsewhere, in summing up the influences which contributed to the creation of *The Ancient Mariner*, he writes "The things that had been impressed upon the eye and the mind, by seeing and by reading, were then moulded in dream: 'my Dreams become the Substances of my Life,' said Coleridge They played a vital part in the final, the subconscious perfecting of *The Ancient Mariner*" (p 255) But Coleridge's remark is from a letter of 1803, and it introduces a passage from *The Pains of Sleep* which describes some of the horrors of opium addiction. Are we to believe that Mr Hanson regards *The Ancient Mariner* as the product of opium dreams, and, if so, to what extent? He does not tell us

The volume collected by E. L. Griggs in honour of Professor Harper of Princeton contains articles on Anna Seward and Henrietta Maria Williams, but the greater part of it consists of esthetic and biographical studies relating to the two poets whose names appear on the title-page. R. D. Havens and O. J. Campbell, who write on "Solitude, Silence, and Loneliness in the Poetry of Wordsworth" and "Wordsworth's Conception of the Esthetic Experience" respectively, approach from different angles what is essentially the same problem, and another related essay, "The Tragic Flaw in Wordsworth's Philosophy" by Newton P. Stallknecht, suggests by implication at least that some of the Wordsworthians will admit that the loss of the stimulus of Coleridge's companionship was a grievous one for him. In "Coleridge on the Sublime" C. D. Thorpe brings together and examines Coleridge's utterances on the subject, of which the most interesting is in a set of definitions printed by Allsop, the original manuscript of which, incidentally, is now in the Cornell University Library. One's only regret about this article is that there was not room to relate Coleridge's definition of the sublime to his theory of imagination.

The biographical studies are all illuminating. Professor de Selincourt analyses the relations between Wordsworth and Edward Quillinan, who became his son-in-law. Miss Edith Morley's article on "Coleridge in Germany," which was based on her examination of the Greenough papers, is reprinted, and scholars will be glad to have it in a more accessible form. The Rev. G. H. B. Coleridge contributes two exceedingly interesting accounts by his great-grandfather of long mountain rambles made in 1799 and 1802, which indicate the nature of some of the materials which Mr. Coleridge has made available to Mr. Hanson and will doubtless enhance the value of the later volumes of his *Life*. The editor's contribution is a critique of *Christabel* by J. J. Morgan, now first printed from

manuscript Though internal evidence seems to show that Coleridge can hardly have had as much to do with its composition as Professor Griggs would like to believe, it undoubtedly owes much to his conversation and contains an illuminating analysis of the effects which Coleridge was trying to achieve in the poem.

R. C. BALD

Cornell University

---

*Lingua Nostra*, Anno I, Febbraio 1939-xvii Sansoni, Florence

Cette nouvelle revue comble une lacune qui s'est fait sentir depuis longtemps en Italie. Il y avait un organe pour les études historiques de la langue italienne, le vénérable *Archivio glottologico italiano*, et depuis une époque plus récente, un organe pour les études de dialectologie, l'*Itala dialettale*—deux représentants de la linguistique du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle qui s'inspiraient de ce singulier mélange d'historisme et de naturalisme qui caractérise ce siècle les dialectes seuls, non la langue littéraire, semblaient pouvoir contribuer à l'histoire d'une langue et être 'dignes d'une histoire'. D'une façon générale, il y avait schisme entre la linguistique et l'histoire littéraire, celle-ci traitant la littérature moderne, celle-là traitant la langue ancienne une œuvre de linguistique 'moderne' comme celle de Brunot n'avait au fond pas de critique compétent. En Italie, De Lollis et Migliorini avaient introduit une linguistique plus proche de l'histoire de la civilisation dans *Cultura*, mais la langue ne trouvait qu'un espace limité dans une revue d'envergure plus large. D'autre part M. Bertoni donnait dans l'*Archivum romanicum* des aperçus de sa philosophie de la langue, s'inspirant à la philosophie de Croce, mais le programme de sa revue, plutôt dédiée au médiévisme et parallèle à la *Romania* française, ne pouvait trop s'occuper des phénomènes modernes de l'italien. Croce lui-même dans sa *Critica*, tout grand inspirateur de la linguistique qu'il soit, et adonné qu'il est à la distinction esthétique de *poesia e non poesia*, n'a jamais montré de l'intérêt pour le microscopisme de la linguistique. Dans tous les pays, on commence à être las du passéisme et à s'intéresser davantage à l'investigation linguistique des évolutions modernes—et ce n'est que justice si, à côté de la revue si bien rédigée de M. Dauzat, *Le français moderne*, et de la moins bien rédigée *Muttersprache* allemande, se place maintenant l'organe italien, dirigé par le romanisant B. Migliorini, l'auteur renommé de l'excellent livre "*Lingua contemporanea*," venant de rentrer en Italie et occuper une chaire à Florence qui lui permettra de faire rayonner son talent, et le classicisant M. Devoto, connu par ses études de syntaxe latine. Evidemment, à une époque où toute



la civilisation évolue et dans un pays où on accentue le côté *volontariste* du développement de la civilisation, les problèmes posés par celle-ci à la langue sont plus nombreux et peuvent être résolus par le concours de savants experts en linguistique aussi bien qu'ouvriers aux questions actuelles *faire de l'histoire* peut aussi bien tenter les savants que l'étudier. On remarquera que le livre de M. Migliorini porte, ainsi que la revue de Dauzat, un titre moins affectif que le nouveau périodique "contemporain" n'inclut pas la nuance patriotique du possessif "nostra" c'est que les éditeurs comptent évidemment avec la résonance du grand public et aussi avec la bonne volonté des autorités fascistes. Je pourrais m'imaginer que des conflits entre la science des historiens du langage et de la politique des gouvernants pourraient naître, que souvent ceux-là devront tout simplement obéir à ceux-ci (on aimerait p. ex. savoir ce que pensent des linguistes du nouveau règlement *ex officio* du pronom allocutoire italien), mais il faut dire loyalement que dans le numéro-spécimen les exigences de la science ne sont pas du tout sacrifiées, que les tendances à réformer la langue cadrent avec la saine raison et que les articles scientifiques, qui portent quelquefois sur des problèmes purement historiques, apportent du nouveau. On remarquera un article suggestif de M. Migliorini sur les courants savant et populaire en italien (avec le vœu fermement exprimé de ne céder en fait de néologismes ni à l'attitude "tour d'ivoire" ni au "plébésisme"), et un article de MM. Bertoni et Ugolini sur "l'axe Rome-Florence" dans la langue italienne (avec le désir de concilier les prononciations de ces deux métropoles de l'italien avec les raisons historiques tirées du latin)—pourquoi d'ailleurs dire *axes* au lieu de *pôles*?

Pour *editoriale* (p. 32) que M. Migliorini voudrait remplacer par *direttoriale*, il faudrait noter que l'*editorial* américain n'est pas du tout identique avec l'*article de fond*, *leader*, *Leitartikel*, tel qu'il est en usage sur le continent européen: les journaux américains offrent en première page les nouvelles "les plus nouvelles" et n'ont pas d'article de fond en tête du numéro. Les *editorials* sont des gloses plus ou moins courtes du jour, pas signées mais exprimant les idées de la direction, à l'intérieur (au milieu) du numéro. Je me rappelle que p. ex. la *Frankfurter Zeitung* a introduit les *editorials* ou gloses commentaires seulement au moment de sa mise au pas avec l'hitlérisme et laisse subsister l'article de fond à côté de cette innovation due au renforcement de la propagande. En France l'*editorial* est identique au *leader*, v. Georges Weill, "Le Journal" (1934), p. 320. "En première page, l'*editorial* et le "leader" prirent un grand développement."

L'article de M. G. Pasquali sur *in casa i Frescobaldi* relève bien le fait que ces restes italiens du cas oblique, plus développé en galloroman, sont attestés seulement pour des noms propres (a. it. *la Dio mercè*, qu'on pourrait ajouter, rentre dans la même catégorie) et que l'italien se refuse au type syntaxique moderne de l'"étiquette" ("cartello") *loggia dei Lanzi*, non pas *via Cavour*, est l'expression autochtone. Je crois en effet que des cas anc. ital. comme *fi' Giovanni*, *lo di San Vito*, *la Dio merce*, *il porco San Antonio* etc., tout dérivés qu'ils sont de génitifs ou de possessifs latino-romans (v. les exemples de génitif latin qui précèdent cette con-

struction au § 438 du "prospetto grammaticale" de la *Crestomazia* de Monaci *figiastro Bonfantini, servi sanote Marie* etc), trahissent une nouvelle conception ancienne romane vis-à-vis de la personnalité c'est celle qui consiste à ne pas transformer un nom propre, entoure de la révérence qui lui est due, par la flexion *la Dio merce* conserve un *Dio* non altéré par les nécessités syntaxiques (la forme phonétique refractaire au système de flexion roman de certains noms bibliques aura contribué à cette immobilité du nom propre qui s'observe déjà dans la Vulgate *filii Israel*, sous l'influence hébraïque) M Foulet a noté le même ton noble du type *la fille le roi* dans sa *Petite Syntaxe de l'anc fr* — mais le système flexionnel italien (qui en général ne connaît pas l'alternance cas sujet—cas-régime) a créé quelque chose de nouveau, qui s'oppose aussi bien au système latin qu'à celui du galloroman l'inaltérabilité du nom propre Bien entendu, les étiquettes syntaxiques du français moderne (*affaire Dreyfus, rue Bonaparte*) et des autres langues qui ont imité le tour français, procèdent d'une autre conception de la personnalité et du nom propre précisément de la depersonnalisation moderne du nom propre, qui devient un en-tête de fiche Le *status constructus* du nom propre en anc ital est donc un fait particulier de cette époque de la langue qui mérite d'être relevé il est d'ailleurs en harmonie avec l'attitude de respect du roman ancien pour le nom propre qui se trahit aussi dans le manque d'article, plus général dans les anciennes langues que dans les modernes — Je crois que l'explication du manque de la préposition *in* dans le fr *chez* (alors que l'anc ital a *in casa* : *Frescobaldi*) ne sera pas l'acc *domum* dans *domum vado* (auquel un *\*casam* aurait succédé) *chez* ne s'emploie pas seulement avec les verbes de mouvement M P est devenu hésitant lui-même en pensant à l'a fr *lez* = *latus* Or, M Lofstedt dans son *Philolog Kommentar* etc a attesté un *latus se* 'à côté de soi' dès la *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* et a rappelé que la préposition latine *circum* n'a pas d'autre origine que l'acc d'un substantif La "prépositionalisation" d'un substantif est donc dans la tradition latine Cf aussi El Richter, *ZRPh*, xxxi, 572 sur le "absoluter Ablativ der Ruhelage" en latin (*theatro* = 'au théâtre') On trouvera là aussi les locutions a fr *a, en ches*, a port *a, em cas*, de sorte que l'italien ne se distingue que par l'absence du masculin *\*casus*, qui, de son côté, pourrait s'expliquer par l'absence de *mansus* en Italie Je me demande si l'autonomie plus grande de *casa* dans l'ital *in casa* : *Frescobaldi* vis-à-vis du fr *chez Dupont* tout à fait prepositionalisé, ne tient pas au fait que la maison de la commune italienne était une entité plus concrète représentant davantage la famille que la maison française M G Serra dans son livre "Continuità nel medioevo delle comunità rurali romane e preromane dell'Italia superiore," p 69, indique que l'ital *casato* 'tutte le famiglie discese dal medesimo stipite,' 'nome di famiglia' etc indique une correspondance "fra l'unità agnaticia di più famiglie e l'unità materiale della dimora comune" l'expression *in casa* : *Frescobaldi* évoque la famille des F résidant dans 'sa' maison, et d'ailleurs ce pluriel collectif : *Frescobaldi* indique "la communione di diritti, di sangue e di dimora fra i membri del gruppo gentilizio" (Serra, *loc cit*, p 73 et aussi dans son article *Dacoromana* III, 523 "Per la storia del cognome italiano," où il cite la phrase de Gaudenzi "La storia del cognome è per un certo rispetto la storia della famiglia") Le fr *chez Dupont* signifie plutôt 'dans la maison d'un seul personnage, Dupont,' parce que la *chaise* (= *casa*) est en a fr 'le vol du chapon, les quatre arpents de terre autour du château qui sont assurés au fils aîné comme héritage' (Richter, *loc cit*), la *casa italiana* est plutôt la demeure d'une collectivité

*La Correspondance de Diderot.* By LESTER GILBERT KRAKEUR  
New York The Kingsley Press, 1939. Pp. 120.

Diderot's correspondence has never been the subject of a special and thorough study. K attempts to supply this long-felt want which, as he points out, is rendered more urgent by the recent publication of André Babelon,<sup>1</sup> which has brought to light a number of new facts concerning Diderot. In his first chapter K. shows how Diderot's correspondence—particularly the recently published letters—enables us to enrich, deepen, and correct some aspects of Diderot's "personnalité morale et intellectuelle," for example the bourgeois character of Diderot, his cunning business sense, his sociability, his sincerity, his "mobilité d'humeur et mobilité d'esprit," the romantic aspects of his nature, some general characteristics of his thought, such as the undisciplined profuseness of his ideas, the largeness of his mind, his enthusiasm, his pessimism, etc. The second chapter seeks to cast a new light on certain problems concerning Diderot's thought, his political ideas, his evolution towards atheism and materialism, his conception of the relationship between morals and religion, between freedom and determinism. Above all K. tries to establish, by means of the correspondence, a more exact chronology of the development of Diderot's ideas (see also Appendix I). Chapter III deals with the correspondence as an *œuvre littéraire*. It contains general remarks on Diderot's style, a too brief enumeration of his forms of expression, and a comparison of Diderot's letters with examples of epistolary form by outstanding letter-writers of the eighteenth century. As a postscript to this chapter the author discusses the correspondence as a "document personnel" and as a "document social." Appendix II deals briefly with Diderot's relationship to his brother. Appendix III corrects certain mistakes made by Babelon in his edition of Diderot's correspondence.

The author would have accomplished his task much more satisfactorily, had he possessed a more exact knowledge of Diderot's works and of the studies devoted to him. His critical remarks on Babelon's edition as well as the demonstration that some themes of Diderot's thought can be dated, by means of the correspondence, earlier than they have been up to now, would have been new if published several years ago. A few observations as K attaches great importance to exact chronology, he should have mentioned the fact that numerous *inédits* of the correspondence between Diderot and Sophie Volland were known as early as 1925 (Paul Lédieu: *Diderot et Sophie Volland*). K is not the first to accuse Diderot of "roublardise." The controversy on this subject is old and does not gain by its new form, particularly since K distorts

<sup>1</sup> *Denis Diderot. Lettres à Sophie Volland.* Publ. par André Babelon, 3 vol. Paris, 1930. *Denis Diderot. Correspondance inédite.* Publ. par A. Babelon, 2 vol. Paris, 1931.

Diderot's texts The same is true of K's objections to Diderot's "franchise" When K writes

Le XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle fut moins un siècle de philosophes que de propagandistes; ceux qu'on appelaient (*sic*) "philosophes" n'étaient pas tant des penseurs profonds s'intéressant à la vérité abstraite, que des vulgarisateurs cherchant à répandre des idées opposées à ce qu'ils considéraient comme des préjugés ou des abus (p. 17),

we understand why his discussion of Diderot's evolution towards materialism and atheism is so unsatisfactory To see in eighteenth century philosophy only a work of vulgarization is a dangerous simplification which makes the understanding of its great themes impossible<sup>2</sup> Why does K constantly try to establish a chronology of Diderot's ideas, only to contradict himself by stating that *all* problems interested Diderot at the very same moment? Attempts to establish a chronological evolution of Diderot's thought have always failed, because they spring from a false comprehension of his very nature There are more important problems concerning Diderot to be solved than the century-old discussion of his evolution towards atheism and materialism

The author of these lines finds it impossible to enter into further details, since K's reasoning seems to him a rather vague basis for a sound discussion He does not believe that K's study of Diderot's correspondence is the one which the author promised to give and which we greatly need A more exact knowledge of Diderot's works, of the studies concerning these works, and of the eighteenth century would have been desirable as well as a more delicate and expert sense of style

HERBERT DIECKMANN

Washington University

---

*The Literature of Slang* By W [ILLIAM] J [EREMIAH] BURKE.

With an Introductory Note by ERIC PARTRIDGE New York.

The New York Public Library, 1939 vii + 180 pp

Mr. Burke's bibliography *The Literature of Slang* is without question an indispensable handbook for libraries and students of unconventional English, for it brings together many references which have appeared since Arthur G. Kennedy's *Bibliography of Writings on the English Language* was compiled On the other hand the form in which this new bibliography is presented leaves much to be desired

<sup>2</sup> How complex and rich the problem of the relationship between "vulgarisation" and "philosophie" in the eighteenth century really is can be seen in the study of Fritz Schalk: *Einleitung in die Encyclopédie der französischen Aufklärung* München, 1936

Mr Burke might well have stated in his preface just what he intended to do. For example this bibliography includes Americanisms and dialect, but the only statement to that effect appears in Mr. Partridge's introduction. Accompanying nearly every entry there are certain code letters for which there is no explanation. Possibly they are intelligible to the staff of the New York Public Library, for Mr Burke's work was reprinted from various numbers of the *New York Public Library* (1936-1938). In its present form the bibliography is divided into ten sections which are listed in a table of contents. No subjects are given in the index, consequently these ten "chapter" headings are the sole means of locating any particular phase of slang. At the beginning of each section the heading given in the table of contents is subdivided, in one case into forty-two subjects. Should one wish to look up references to articles on Quick Lunch, Soda Fountain, or Aquarium slang, it is first necessary to know that these are occupations and then leaf through the pages of that section until the desired topic turns up.

The index, which lists authors only, differs from the usual run of indexes in that it gives a short title under the author's names. These short titles, however, can be very misleading, for if an author has compiled various magazine articles into one book, only the title of the book is given, and one must dig through Mr Burke's note on that book for reference to the individual article. (Cf Bowen, Edwin Winfield, p. 36). Another phase of this faulty indexing appears under the entry for A. G. Empey (p. 127). Only one of his books appears under the author's name in the index, but another is mentioned in Mr. Burke's note to the first. Although there are numerous entries under Pierce Egan in the index, his edition of Grose's *Vulgar Tongue* is not among them and can be located only by guessing that it must be traced through Grose.

On Mr. Burke's own admission (p. 158) "authors mentioned in the notes are not indexed." Needless to say these references are lost and yet they include such items as "David Humphrey's glossary of Americanisms, which appeared in the back of his play *The Yankee in England*, 1815" (p. 14 under Mathews, Mitford McLeod). It is probable that no less than half of the names mentioned in this bibliography are buried in the notes.

Besides these mechanical defects there are numerous errors and omissions throughout the bibliography. *American Speech* is listed as a separate entry but *Dialect Notes* is not, even though its various articles are included. There seems to be no mention of *American Literature*. Under Thornton's *An American Glossary* (p. 10), Mr. Burke refers to the *Historical dictionary of the American language* and yet on another page (p. 4) he gives its correct title: *A dictionary of American English on historical principles*. Mr. Burke gives two references from *Harper's bazar* under Higginson (p. 33) but his note on this author says "Higginson conducted a column in *Harper's bazar*, and many of his articles are devoted to slang,

dialect, and speech problems" Kennedy gives three of Higginson's articles which are not included by Burke (K—1894, 11450, 11909) Mr Burke says of the one-volume edition of Farmer and Henley, *Slang and its analogues* (p 5) "The abridged edition published by E P Dutton & Co was reviewed 1922" This would seem to imply that the work appeared about that time. Actually it was published in 1905 by Geo Routledge & Sons in London Basil Hargrave's *Origin and meanings of popular phrases & names* is listed (p 6) but the 1925 edition of this work which includes "those which came into use during the great war" is omitted. Mr Burke in his preface makes acknowledgment of his indebtedness to various people but in small type under the entry for A G. Kennedy's *A bibliography of writings on the English language* . . (p 61) is the remark "This is the standard authority on the English language, and the compiler makes acknowledgment for the help it has afforded him." This might well have appeared in the preface.

A bibliography is useful in the degree to which it serves its purpose Mr Burke's *The Literature of Slang* misses its objective by the lack of a good index—the material is there if you can find it.

J LOUIS KUETHE

*The Johns Hopkins University Library*

*Two Bookes of Constancie Written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius. Englished by Sir John Stradling. Edited with an Introduction by RUDOLPH KIRK Notes by CLAYTON MORRIS HALL. New Brunswick, New Jersey Rutgers University Press, 1939. Pp x + 224 \$4.50.*

In this second publication of the Rutgers English series, the student of the Renaissance has one of the more important documents of sixteenth century Christian stoicism in a form that he will find more easy to read than the original text of the *De Constantia*. While the scholar would prefer a modern translation of Lipsius' treatise, Stradling's translation is, however, more faithful to the thought and letter of the original than the usual translation of the Tudor age.

To the reprint of Stradling's text, Professor Kirk has prefixed a biographical account of Lipsius drawn from those of Nisard, Zanta, and others, a short notice on the English translations of stoic sources; a statement of Lipsius' deviations from the creed of classical stoicism, and a summary of the text. A thorough student of Lipsius' life and writings might quarrel with some of the points in the biography, but it would be a quarrel with Professor Kirk's authorities and not with Professor Kirk. He might also emend

Professor Kirk's lists of vernacular editions of the stoics by observing that the first Dutch translation of Epictetus came in 1564 and not in 1615, that the same author was in Italian in 1551, that Seneca was in French before 1578 and in Italian long before 1717. But these are small points and of interest only to minute scholarship.

One can make similar observations about Professor Kirk's further essays. There is no doubt that his discussion of Lipsius' variants on the stoic theme would have been enhanced by a study of Lipsius' more formal treatments of the sect, by a consideration of the *Manuductio ad Stoicam Philosophiam* and the *Physiologia Stoicorum*. These works supply the spine to the *De Constantia*, they are what Zeller is to Durant. If this section of Professor Kirk's introduction indicates anything, it is the thinness of our knowledge of sixteenth century philosophies. A discussion of free will, for example, cannot be made on the basis of one Renaissance philosopher against the classics. Such a discussion can be of value only when the minds of many men are sifted. Pontano, Ficino, Alberti, and Pico della Mirandola had strangely different notions on this question and yet their milieu is essentially the same. Professor Kirk's discussion becomes then a challenge to restudy the movements of ancient systems as they filtered through the minds of Renaissance men, and in that respect it is a very useful piece of writing.

In conclusion, one must say a few words about Mr Hall's notes. Lipsius, like all scholars of his period, studded his margins with the names of authorities, and Mr Hall has put himself to infinite pains to identify the exact source of all these references. He has even tracked down the blind references that occurred in the text. Such a labor not only is beneficial to the reader, but enables one to gauge the breadth of Lipsius' reading and his method of utilizing what he read.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Duke University

---

*Nicholas Udall's Roister Doister*. Edited by G. SCHEURWEGHS.

Materials for the Study of the Old English Drama, Vol. xvi.  
Louvain Ch. Uystpruyst, 1939. Pp. lxxxiv + 132.

It is always good to see an old friend newly attired, and this edition of *Roister Doister* is certainly the most elaborate and impressive that has as yet appeared. It forms the first volume of a projected study of Udall which will include editions of the *Floures*, the translations from Erasmus, and an attempt to identify Udall's *comœdæ plures*.

Perhaps the most impressive part of the volume is the biographical introduction, for which Dr. Scheurweghs has obviously spent months of patient research in the Public Record Office and in the various

episcopal registers and collegiate record-books of the sixteenth century. While it is true that the general outlines of Udall's life are not radically altered from older accounts such as Flugel's, many interesting details—too numerous to be cited here—are added and sources quoted in full. It is not pleasant to learn that Udall was ousted from his mastership at Eton for homosexuality, but it is pleasant to have unexpurgated documentation (p. xxiv). After a careful discussion of the classical sources and the English literary relations, an elaborate argument for a date between 1545 and 1552 is given, then the text of the unique Eton quarto is reproduced exactly, with ordinary roman used for the original semi-blackletter. The annotation builds effectively on the comments of previous editors and Dr. Scheurweghs casts considerable light on matters of liturgical and ecclesiastical nature, e.g., the mock requiem in lines 969 ff., details of which were misunderstood by previous editors.

A comment may be in order on the occurrence in the Eton quarto of the "puzzling" ligature *ée* which "is used generally for all originally long *e* sounds" (p. 90). Frank Isaac in his *English Printers' Types of the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford Press, 1936), pp. 36-37, says "The most popular textura (1 *e* the semi-blackletter, twenty lines of which measure about 82 mm., used by most printers including the greatest of them—John Day) was the 82 more ligatures were added, the most noticeable being the *ee* with an accent on the first *e*." I conjecture that the fount was almost certainly brought in from abroad (perhaps actual matrices were imported) and the letter cast at some common source in England. If the type came from the low countries, a ligature *ée* would be most useful, especially in printing French. As to the form, it was not unusual to start out with a character *â*, file it down to *á*, and wind up with *a*. Perhaps then the ligature *ée* was intended to be filed down to *ee* but no one got around to doing it. Dr. Scheurweghs apparently rejects the conjecture of the *Short Title Catalogue* that the probable printer of the unique Eton copy, which lacks a title-page, was Henry Denham, since he refers to "the printer" throughout. But in Denham's edition of John Marbecke's prose *The Lyues of holy Sanctes* (1574), which Dr. C. F. Buhler of the Pierpont Morgan Library has kindly examined for me, the following forms are found: *séeing*, *mée*, *kéepe*, *dée*, *hée*, and even in Bethléem, where the ligature doubtless stands for a diaeresis. It is similarly used in Day's first edition of Ascham's *Scholemaster* (1570). Therefore I do not think that the accent mark was deemed to have any phonetic value, the printer simply used the only ligature that he had, i.e., *ée*, whenever he found double *e* in his copy. The two instances of plain ligature without accent on line 321 and 432 of *Roister Doister* would then have to be explained as two types which had been filed down or as two instances when the ink made no impress.

There are a few blemishes. It is awkward (p. xxxix) to say that



"he composed an answer to the Rebels of Cornwall and Devonshire" and then contradict this by stating a few lines further that "the answer, however, is not Udall's, but Philip Nichol's", and there are a few misprints on p lxxviii for dispoſal read diſpoſal, on p 101 for mens read meus, on p 109 read Catholic rites, and it should be C. M. Gayley on p lxxxiii and p 130 But these are unimportant matters, all students of our earlier drama must remain greatly indebted to Dr Scheurweghs for his splendid work.

R H BOWERS

St Petersburg Junior College

---

### BRIEF MENTION

---

*Studies in Iconology Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance.* By ERWIN PANOFSKY New York Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xxxiii + 262. \$3 50. The six studies contained in this handsome volume were delivered as the Mary Flexner lectures at Bryn Mawr College in 1937 Though they were not entirely unpublished even at that date, their present appearance in print is welcome in view of their former relative inaccessibility to the American public and their now beautiful and copious illustration. As usual, Professor Panofsky's work touches on several fields of interest and on mediums of expression other than those of the figurative arts With extraordinary range of reference and synthesis, the essays on *Father Time*, on *Blind Cupid*, on the *Neoplatonic Movement in Florence and North Italy* and on the *Neoplatonic Movement and Michelangelo* elucidate, through examination of various "icons," cultural and creative interplays and trends from Classical times to the late Renaissance in ways of decided interest for any historian of almost any aspect of European culture over that long period The historian of ideas will certainly be very directly concerned with these studies, and in the second essay on the *Early History of Man* will find a considerable contribution to the study of Primitivism It is especially the introductory essay of this volume which deserves the close attention of the historian and critic of art in the medium of words Here is a statement of methodology which one would like to find at the front of every history of literature In terms of *object*, *act* and *controlling principle of interpretation* as well as *equipment for interpretation*, Professor Panofsky leaves no doubt whatever as to the basis, range and goal of his science. The object of that science lends itself to three

spheres of meaning which are here clearly defined. These meanings are in no large way new even to the literary historian. Yet one wonders if the latter has as yet attained the basic theoretical statement of his methodology in terms which can stand or fall beside those of Panofsky for Iconology? Certainly it can be safely said that the historian of literary art too often fails to include in his "equipment for interpretation" the equivalent of Panofsky's "knowledge of literary sources", namely a *knowledge of iconographical sources*.

CHARLES S. SINGLETON

---

*Johnsonian Gleanings Part IX, A Further Miscellany.* By ALEYN LYELL READE. Privately Printed (Treleaven House, Blundellsands near Liverpool), 1939. Pp. iv + 282. 21s. We had come to think of Mr. Reade's pleasant *Gleanings* as planned on Sterne's generous scale: if not two volumes a year, at least one in two years, indefinitely. But it appears that the series is really coming to an end. Part X will be "a straightforward account of Johnson's life down to 1740" and Part XI will be a consolidated index. The present volume collects and dismisses with rueful humor all the genealogical problems which Mr. Reade has been holding back in the hope that he would ultimately arrive at complete solutions. The greater part of it is to be consulted rather than read, but all Johnsonians will be entertained and enlightened by the chapter on Parson Ford, and by the full account of Johnson's efforts, at the end of his life, to assist his relatives, the Misses Collier, in obtaining their inheritance from their step-father, Mr. Flint. Mr. Reade confesses with deep contrition his inability to tell us how the Misses Collier were related to the Doctor, and he does not know whether or not they ever got justice, but he has no difficulty in demonstrating Johnson's humanity. It is a pleasure beyond the bounds of expectation to be able to amplify one of his genealogies. The cousinship which Boswell claimed with Capt. William Maxwell of Dalswinton was fairly close, Capt. Maxwell's mother and Boswell being first cousins of the half blood. I have sent Mr. Reade a "narrative pedigree."

FREDERICK A. POTTLE

New Haven, Connecticut

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

CHAUCER'S MONK In the May number of *MLN* (pp 350 ff) Professor Tatlock makes two statements in his discussion of Chaucer's Monk that perhaps are open to question. The bearing on his main point must for the present be postponed. First, Tatlock says "no medieval would use 'Monk' of an Augustinian canon." According to the *NED* ("Canon"), however, "the difference between *canon regular* (i.e. Augustinian) and a *monk*, became in the later Middle Ages (as now in the R.C.Ch.) so slight that the one is frequently confused with the other." Moreover the *NED* cites Littré "Thus Littré explains Augustinian Canons as '*moines, dits aussi hermites de Saint-Augustin*'" With this statement may also be compared the *Cath. Ency* ("Monk"). Secondly, Tatlock remarks that St. Edward the Confessor "was not a specially prominent saint in the fourteenth century." Evidence, at least in the reign of Richard II and therefore pertinent to our discussion, points to the contrary. At his coronation King Richard solemnly swore "to grant and keep the laws and customs granted by the ancient kings of England, and namely the laws granted by the glorious king Saint Edward." The next year (1378) church and state openly clashed as a result of the murder of John Hawley at the base of the Confessor's shrine, the King was represented at the next meeting of Parliament by none other than Wycliffe. Saint Edward was a rallying point for the King in the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. Before going to Smithfield to quell the mob Richard first went to the shrine of the Confessor, "where he knelt long in prayer." Richard II, according to Dean Stanley (I, 176), removed the grandchildren of Edward I "from their place in the Confessor's Chapel. . . and on the vacant site thus secured was raised the tomb for his wife, Anne of Bohemia." Even the Irish, according to Froissart writing the following year, "loued and dredde hym (i.e. St. Edward) moche more than any other kyng of Englande that had been before." Capitalizing on this King Richard in 1394 while in Ireland "lefte the beryng of the armes of Englande and bare the armes of thys saynt Edward" whereof it was said the garrison were well pleased, and the sooner they enclyned to hym. "The Confessor, remarks Froissart, is "honoured through all this realm." The contemporary Wilton Diptych in the National Portrait Gallery depicts King Richard being introduced to the "Blessed Virgin with the Child, accompanied by her Court of Angels," by Saint John the Baptist, Saint Edmund, and St. Edward the Confessor. The importance of the Confessor as a national saint in the time of the *Canterbury Tales* can further be inferred from what took place in 1397 in this year temporal and spiritual peers of Parliament swore upon the shrine of the Confessor that they would "never suffer the judgements, statutes, and ordinances of that year to be revoked." Henry IV was crowned on Saint Edward's day, and his last prayers were said at the saint's shrine. But—a matter for another time—King Henry was buried opposite another national saint, Thomas Becket.

E. P. KUHL

State University of Iowa

AS BY THE WHELP CHASTISED IS THE LEON In *MLN.* LV (1940), 209 10, Mr C S Brown and Mr R H West suggest that in using this expression in the *Squire's Tale* Chaucer "was referring to a matter of common knowledge and possibly current practice, rather than to a learned proverb of obscure origin," since "lion tamers of the 13th century apparently did beat dogs in order to intimidate their pets" But this proverb is less learned and of less obscure origin than they assume It was long ago connected with the animal trainer's arts, and both proverb and practice were widely cited before Chaucer's day The saying appears first in St Ambrose in the 4th century *Caeditur canis, ut pavescat leo* Egbert of Liege in his popular *Fecunda Ratis* refers to it in the early 11th century as *Ceditur, ut feritas paveat, canis ante leonem* Another Latin form of a little later day is *Percutitur sepe canis, ut timeat leo fortis* By the end of the 13th or beginning of the 14th century we find it in a French version of *Aesopus* *Por l'orguil dou lyon rabatre, / Fait l'on le chien devant lui batre* A MS of ca 1317 reads *Por donter, bat on le chien devant le lyon* And in *Les Diz et Proverbes des Sages*, written about the year that Chaucer was born, we have *A la foiz avient que li hom / Bat le chien devant le lyon* Of this immensely popular work some thirty MSS survive In English the proverb appears as *By the litul welphys me chastys þe lyon*<sup>1</sup> So much for the proverb References to the practice and illustrations of it had also become traditional Thomas de Cantimpré, Albertus Magnus and Vincent of Beauvais allude to it in Latin, Lambert d'Ardre, Villard de Honnecourt and others in French Various representations of it are discussed by Johannes Bolte Röhrich mentions a similar proverb in Arabic If you strike the dog, the ounce will behave. Now with so much evidence for the early and widespread popularity of the theme it hardly seems likely that the English Chaucer was much concerned with the actual art of the lion tamer when he used this expression, any more than was Shakespeare when Iago says (*Othello* II, 3): Even so as one would beat his defenseless dog to affright an imperious lion.

GRACE FRANK

*Bryn Mawr College*

---

<sup>1</sup> The English version is in a 15th century MS, but its editor believes because of the language that the scribe was copying an earlier collection, perhaps of the 14th century See Max Foerster, "Die mittelhenglische Sprichwortersammlung in Douce 52," *Festschrift zum XII allgemeinen Deutschen Neuphilologentage in München, 1906*, Erlangen, 1906, p 49, no 63 A convenient bibliography for the study of this proverb is in Archer Taylor, "An Index to 'The Proverb'," *FF Communications*, No. 113, Helsinki, 1934, p 28 A picture of the lion-tamer and further references will be found in *Proverbes en Rimes* (ed Frank and Miner), Plate CLVII and notes to 1255-6.

BAUDELAIRE AND BANDY In a note entitled "A self estimate by Baudelaire" (*MLN*, LV, 297-8), Mr W T Bandy cites two passages one from *Le magasin des familles* (June, 1850) and another from *Le messenger de l'assemblée* (April 9, 1851) both of which were known (Cf *Oeuvres complètes*, ed Nouv Rev Fr, II, 162-63). He maintains that all editors of *Les fleurs du mal* assumed that the first note was added by Leo Lespes, concludes from the similarity of the two notes that Baudelaire must have written them himself, and makes the point that, if this is true, we have here "one of the earliest recorded appraisals by Baudelaire of his own work". There is no objection to publishing a blurb as a serviceable document, but assumptions and deductions are risky based on such slight evidence. First, it is not true that all editors have assumed that the first note is from Leo Lespes' pen. Mr Bandy can refer to one of our best scholarly editions of Baudelaire's works cited above. Secondly, the note from *Le messenger* which Mr Bandy publishes for his argument sounds like a piece of advertising, it incorporates the first but with a significant change "agitations spirituelles". No process of thought can determine who wrote it. Baudelaire's attitude on such matters is clearly indicated in a letter addressed to Antonio Watrison from which I quote a pertinent passage.

Vous pourrez ajouter à cela *Physiologie du rire*, qui paraîtra, prochainement, à la *Revue de Paris*, sans doute, ainsi que *Salon des Caricaturistes*, et *Les Limbes, poésies*, chez Michel Levy. Ce ne sera pas un mensonge, puisque cela va paraître très-prochainement, et sans doute avant le volume de biographie. Mais tout ceci me semble bien vaniteux. Arrangez, supprimez, faites ce que vous voudrez. Si j'ai oublié quelque chose, tant pis (*Oeuvres complètes*, ed cit, VII, 61).

In conclusion, I should be inclined to say that both blurbs, as they are extremely trite, smack of routine advertising, that they have documentary value, but no value, from the evidence we have, so far as Baudelaire's self-criticism is concerned, and that their documentary significance was utilized several years ago.

EMILE MALAKIS

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Bacon—Essais Traduits, avec une introduction, par Maurice Castelain *Paris* Aubier, 1940 Pp xlii + 312 30 fr (Col lection Bilingue des Classiques Anglais)

Ballads and Songs—Coll Missouri Folk Lore Society Ed H M Belden *Columbia, Missouri* U of Mo Press, 1940 Pp xx + 530 \$1 25 (University of Missouri Studies, XV, 1)

Boas, Frederick S—Christopher Marlowe, a biographical and critical study *Oxford* Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1940 Pp xii + 336 \$4 50

Bronson, B H, Caldwell, J R, Cline, J M, McKenzie, Gordon, and Ross, J F—Five studies in literature *Berkeley, Calif* U of Calif Press, 1940 Pp vi + 153 \$1 50 (U of Calif Pubs in English, Vol 8, 1) ["Chaucer's art in relation to his audience," "Hamlet dramatist," "Hydriotaphia," "Swift reason and some of its consequences," and "Beauty is truth"]

Buck, Philo M, Jr—An anthology of world literature (Revised edition) *New York* Macmillan, 1940 Pp xvi + 1148 \$4 00

Dahl, Ivar—Substantial inflexion in early Old English, vocalic stems *Lund* Gleerup, 1938 Pp xvi + 206 10 Kr (Lund Studies in English, vii)

Dialect Notes, Vol vi, Part xix—Ed Miles L Hanley *New Haven, Conn* American Dialect Society, 1939 Pp 44 \$1 00

Engblom, Victor—On the origin and early development of the auxiliary *Do* *Lund* Gleerup, 1938 Pp 169 8 Kr (Lund Studies in English, vi)

Frenz, Horst—Die entwicklung des sozialen dramas in England vor Galsworthy *Bleicherode am Harz* Carl Nieft, 1938 Pp 69

Hutson, Arthur E—British personal names in the *Historia Regum Britanniae* *Berkeley, Calif* U of Calif Press, 1940 Pp iv + 160 \$1 50 (U of Calif Pubs in English, Vol 5, 1)

Irving, William H—John Gay, favorite of the wits *Durham, N C* Duke U Press, 1940. Pp xii + 334 \$3 50

Jenkins, Romilly. —Dionysius Solomós *Cambridge* University Press, 1940 Pp xi + 225 \$2 25

Kruisinga, E—An introduction to the

study of English sounds Seventh edition *Groningen, Batavia* Noordhoff, 1940 Pp 218 f 2 50

Lowery, Margaret R—Windows of the morning, a critical study of William Blake's *Poetical Sketches*, 1783 *New Haven, Conn* Yale U Press, 1940 Pp xii + 249 \$3 00 (Yale Studies in English, 93)

Rich, Townsend—Harrington and Ariosto, a study in Elizabethan verse translation *New Haven, Conn* Yale U Press, 1940 Pp viii + 231 \$2 00 (Yale Studies in English, 92)

Sherwin, Reider T—The Viking and the Red Man, the Old Norse origin of the Algonquin language *New York* Funk and Wagnalls, 1940 Pp xxvi + 340 \$2 50

Strom, Hilmer—Old English personal names in Bede's History, an etymological-phonological investigation *Lund* Gleerup, 1939 Pp xiv + 180 10 Kr (Lund Studies in English, viii)

Temple, William—The genius of English poetry The English Association Presidential Address, 1939 *New York* Oxford U Press, 1940 Pp 15 \$0 75

Workman, Samuel K—Fifteenth century translation as an influence on English prose *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp x + 210 \$2 00 (Princeton Studies in English, 18)

Wright, Louis B—The first gentlemen of Virginia, intellectual qualities of the early colonial ruling class *San Marino, Calif* Huntington Library, 1940 Pp xii + 373 \$3 75

## GERMAN

Ackerknecht, Erwin—Gottfried Keller Geschichte seines Lebens Mit 16 Bildtafeln *Leipzig* Insel-Verl 1939 386 pp M 8 50

Allgower, Walther—Gemeinschaft, Vaterland und Staat im Werk Holderlins Diss *Basel Frauenfeld* Huber, 1939 171 pp

Brandt, Gustav-Adolf—Herder und Gorres 1798/1807 Ein Beitrag zur Frage Herder und die Romantik Diss *Berlin* [Stadion, Bd 3] *Wurzburg* Triltsch, 1938 71 pp M 2 40

Brentano, Clemens—Das unsterbliche Leben Unbekannte Briefe Hrsg von Wilhelm Schellberg und Friedrich Fuchs. (Mit 20 Abb u 3 Hs-Proben) *Jena* Diederichs [1939]. 558 pp M 6 50

Carnap, Ernst Gunther—Das Schaferwesen in der deutschen Literatur des 17 Jhs. und die Hirtendichtung Europas Diss *Frankfurt* *Wurzburg* Mayr, 1939 81 pp

Debus, Kurt—Einsamkeit und Stille in der Dichtung Adalbert Stifters Diss *Frankfurt a. M* Kalinowski & Debus, 1939 89 pp

Dzialas, Ingrid — Auffassung und Darstellung der Elemente bei Goethe Diss Frankfurt [Germanische Studien H 216] *Berlin*. Ebering, 1939 171 pp M 6 60

Faesi, Robert — Gottfried Keller [Aus Grosse Schweizer 1938] *Zurich* Atlantis-Verl [1938] 11 pp

— Heinrich Leuthold [Aus Grosse Schweizer, 1938] *Zurich* Atlantis-Verl [1938] 4 pp

Gesamtkatalog, Deutscher Hrsq von der Preuss Staatsbibliothek Bd 14 Beauchamp—Beethordnung *Berlin* Preussische Druckerei- und Verlags-A G 1939 960 cols folio M 85

Grimm, Herman — Das Leben Goethes, Neubearb u eingeleitet von Reinhard Buchwald [Kroners Taschenausgabe Bd 162] *Stuttgart* Kroner [1939] xl, 512 pp M 4 75.

Grossrieder, Hans — Reinhard Johannes Sorges "Bettler" Der Schopfungsgang des ersten expressionistischen Dramas Diss *Freiburg, Schweiz* Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1939 112 pp

Hahn, Walter v — Darmstadter Familiennamen bis zum Ende des 16 Jhs Mit einer Karte [Giessener Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie 69] *Giessen* von Münchow, 1939 74 pp M 2 50

Heckel, Hermann — Das ethische Wortfeld in Wolframs Parzival Diss *Erlangen Würzburg* Triltsch, 1939 112 pp. M 3

Heselhaus, Clemens — Anton Ulrichs Aramena Studien zur dichterischen Struktur d deutschbarocken "Geschichtgedicht" Diss *Münster* [Bonner Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie H 9] *Würzburg* Triltsch, 1939 117 pp M 3 30

Hoffmann, Oliva — Die Menschengestaltung in C F Meyers Renaissance-Novellen Diss *Hamburg* [Germanische Studien H 219] *Berlin* Ebering, 1940 207 pp M 8 10

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. Hrsq von der Ges f deutsche Philologie in *Berlin* (Jg 57) N F Bd 15 Bibliographie 1935 *Berlin*. de Gruyter, 1939 340 pp. M 16

[Kippenberg, Anton] — Ihrem Präsidenten Herrn Professor Dr Julius Petersen huldigt an seinem sechzigsten Geburtstag, dem 5 Nov 1938, die Stadelmann-Gesellschaft [Darin Goethe Vollmondnacht, Faksimile] [Schriften d Stadelmann-Ges Bd 19] [Weimar. Stadelmann Ges, 1938] 5 leaves, 4°

— Bibliographie Kippenberg Verzeichnis der von Prof Dr Anton Kippenberg verfassten, herausgegebenen und übersetzten Schriften und Aufsätze Als Hs gedruckt [Zum 65 Geburtstag am 22. Mai 1939, von Julius Rodenberg] *Leipzig*: [Offizin Haag-Drugulin] 1939. 65 pp

Koschlig, Manfred — Grimmelshausen und seine Verleger Untersuchungen über die Chronologie seiner Schriften und den Echtheitscharakter der frühen Ausgaben Diss *Berlin* [Palaestra 218] *Leipzig* Akad Verlagsges 1939 viii, 308 pp M 25

Kruger, Hans Karl — Berliner Romantik und Berliner Judentum Mit zahlreichen bisher unbekannten Briefen und Dokumenten Diss Teildruck *Bonn* Rohrscheid [1939] 143 pp M 3 80

Kuhnhold, Ingeburg — Seifrits Alexander Diss *Berlin* *Dresden* Dittert, 1939 141 pp

Lohmeyer, Dorothea — Faust und die Welt Zur Deutung des 2 Teiles der Dichtung Diss *Frankfurt Potsdam* Athenaion [1940] 153 pp M 5 50

Matthaei, R — Versuche zu Goethes Farbenlehre mit einfachen Mitteln Ein Aufriss der Farbenlehre mit 32 Abb im Text *Jena* Fischer, 1939 xvi, 130 pp. M 2 50

Michels, Josef — Adalbert Stifter Leben, Werk und Wirken Mit 8 Kunstdrucktafeln *Berlin* *Zsolnay*, 1939 315 pp M 4 50

Monke, Eduard — Briefe Hrsq von Friedrich Seebass *Tubingen* R Wunderlich [1939] xxv, 876 pp M 9 50

Müller, Irmgard — Gerhart Hauptmann und Frankreich Diss [Sprache und Kultur der germ u roman Völker C, Bd 18] *Breslau* Priebatsch, 1939 ix, 184 pp M 7 50

Otto, Walter — Der griechische Göttermythos bei Goethe und Holderlin [Schriften f d geist Überlieferung H. 2] *Berlin* H. Kupper [1939] 47 pp M 1 75

Petersen, Julius — Geschichtsdrama und nationaler Mythos Grenzfragen zur Gegenwartsform des Dramas *Stuttgart*: J B Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940 61 pp M 2 85

Petsch, Robert — Die lyrische Dichtkunst. Ihr Wesen und ihre Formen [Handbucherei der Deutschkunde Bd 4] *Halle* Niemeyer, 1939 154 pp M 3 20

Piwonka, Hubert — Handbuch der deutschen Lyrik Mit zahlreichen bisher un veröffentlichten Beiträgen bedeutender deutscher Dichter *Wien, Leipzig*: Saturn-Verl 1940 205 pp M 7 50

Rosenfeld, Hans-Friedrich — Mittelniederländische Reimchroniken. Mit 1 Taf in Lichtdruck [Aus: Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique 13] *Greifswald* Bamberg, 1939 145 pp M 3 60

Uschmann, Georg — Der morphobiologische Vollkommenheitsbegriff bei Goethe und seine problemgeschichtlichen Zusammenhänge Diss. Aus d Ernst-Haeckel-Haus, Anst. f. Gesch d Zoologie, insbes. d. Entwicklungslehre d Univ *Jena* *Jena*: Fischer, 1939. vi, 103 pp M 4 50

Waidson, H M — F M Klingers Stellung

zur Geistesgeschichte seiner Zeit Diss Leipzig *Dresden* Dittert, 1939 130 pp

Walter, Daniel — Zum Ratsel um die Wanderungen Walthers von der Vogelweide Ein Beitrag zu seiner Losung [*Graz* 1937] 43 pp

— Hagen-Hödur Ein Beitrag zu einer sudgermanischen Edda [*Graz* 1939] Pp 5-24 M 1

Wehrli, Max — Johann Jakob Bodmer [Aus Grosse Schweizer 1938] *Zurich* Atlantis-Verl 7 pp

— Salomon Gessner [Aus Grosse Schweizer 1938] *Zurich* Atlantis Verl 5 pp.

### FRENCH

Alessio, L — Vocabolario dell'argot e del linguaggio popolare parigino *Turin* Pettini, 1939 xvi + 100 pp

Baardman, G G — L'œuvre pédagogique d'A Vinet Paris diss *Groningen* Wolters, 1939

Baumann, W — Vertu Die Bedeutung d'Wortes in d' franz Renaissance *Berlin* Ebering, 1939 141 pp

Bishop, Morris — Ronsard Prince of Poets *New York* Oxford U Press, 1940 iv + 253 pp \$3 00

Bouvier, B — Henri-Frédéric Amiel *Zurich* Atlantis-Verlag, 1939 8 pp

Camerlynck-Guernier, Mme et G — H Camerlynck — The Essentials of Fr Conversation *Paris* Didier, 1938. 146 pp

Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la Bibliothèque nationale T CLV Rollin-Rosenzweig *Paris* Impr nat, 1939 592 pp

Childs, Frances S — French Refugee Life in the U S, 1790-1800 *Baltimore* Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 247 pp \$3 00

Dauzat, Albert — Tableau de la langue fr *Paris* Payot, 1939 303 pp Fr 30

Delorme, Hugues — Poètes de Montmartre *Journville le-Pont* Carlier, 1939 24 pp

Fentross, P — Studien zur Vokalsegmentierung in Sudfrankreich Die Diphthongierung offener Vokale im Cervennischen *Hamburg* diss, 1940 99 pp

Friedrich, Hugo — Die Klassiker des franz Romans Stendhal, Balzac, Flaubert *Leipzig* Bibliog Inst, 1939 154 pp

Harms, K — Personifizierungen im sudfranz Sprachgebrauch *Hamburg* diss, 1940 82 pp

Harvitt, Hélène — Representative Fr Plays from the Fr Theatre of Today [Vildrac, Sarment, Bernstein, Lenormand, Claudel] *Boston*. Heath, 1940 lv + 442 pp.

Hatcher, Anna G — Consecutive Clauses in Old French. *Paris*. Geuthner, 1939. 40 pp

Jonker, G. D — Le Protestantisme et le

théâtre de langue fr au XVI<sup>e</sup>s *Groningen*. Wolters, 1939 250 pp

Kirseck, Ilse — Anna E Comtesse de Noailles *Jena* diss, 1939 78 pp

Lacretelle, Pierre de — Mme de Stael et les hommes *Paris* Grasset, 1939 317 pp Fr 24

Lancaster, H C — A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century Part IV, the Period of Racine, 1673 1700 2 v *Baltimore* Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 984 pp \$10 00

Laroche, Dr L — Les Sources bourguignonnes de la "Rotisserie de la reine Pédauque" d'Anatole France *Tournus*. Amis des arts, 1938 14 pp

Micks, Wilson and Olga Longi — Fundamental French *New York* Oxford U Press, 1940 xxii + 295 pp

Painter, Sidney — French Chivalry Chivalric Ideas and Practices in Mediaeval France *Baltimore* Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 x + 179 pp \$2 00

Parker, C S — Fr Practice Book *Boston*: Heath (1940) xii + 287 pp

Rees, Garnet — Remy de Gourmont *Paris* Boivin (1940). x + 312 pp

Répertoire de bibliog fr Fasc IX Arbitrage-Armieux *Paris* Letouzey et Ané, 1939 128 pp

Riveline, Maurice — Montaigne et l'amitié *Paris* Alcan, 1939 ii + 268 pp Fr 40

Rosenberg, Zelda — La Persistance du subjectivisme chez les poètes parnassiens *Paris*. Presses universitaires, 1939 ii + 183 pp

Soufflet, Ed — Poètes du XVI<sup>e</sup>s *Paris* Hachette, 1939 96 pp Fr 250

Souza, Sybil de — La Philosophie de Marcel Proust *Paris* Rieder, 1939 176 pp Fr 20

Spanke, Hans — Untersuchung über die Ursprünge des romanischen Minnesangs T 2, Marcabrudi Studien *Göttingen* Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1940 viii + 119 pp

Toulouse, Madeleine — La Nation anglaise-allemande de l'Univ de Paris, des origines à la fin du XV<sup>e</sup>s *Paris* Sirey, 1939 183 pp Fr 35

Voltaire — Poème sur la loi naturelle, crit ed F J Crowley *Berkeley* U of Cal, 1938 132 pp (Pubs of U of Cal at L. A.)

Wagner, R. L — Les Phrase hypothétiques commençant par "si" dans la langue fr, des origines à la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup>s *Paris* Droz, 1939 555 pp

— "Sorcier" et "magicien" *Ibid*, 1939 292 pp

White, Mary M — Fr. Objective Tests. *Boston* Heath (1940) 32 pp

Wolf, R. H — Der Stil der Rhetoriker *Gießen*. Roman Sem., 1939. 95 pp



## ITALIAN

Ariosto, L.—Carmina Praefatus est, recensuit, italice vertit, adnotationibus instructum A Bolaffi *Modena* Società Tipografica modenese, 1939 150 pp L 35

Bertoni, Giulio—Dante 2a ediz corretta e rifusa *Milano* Bietti, 1939 64 pp L 5

Bonnes, C.—Il dolce stil novo Saggio critico *Modena* Società tipografica modenese, 1939 104 pp L 20

Campanella, T.—Epilogo magno Testo italiano inedito con le varianti dei codici e delle edizioni latine, a cura di C Ottaviano *Roma* R Accademia d'Italia, 1940 610 pp L 50

Canuti, Francesco—Catalogo dei manoscritti che esistevano in Urbino nella Biblioteca del Papa Clemente XI, con notizie sull'origine della famiglia Albani e la descrizione del palazzo degli Albani in Urbino *Fano* Rossini, 1939 60 pp L 5

Capasso, Aldo—Studi sul Tasso Minore Serie prima *Genova* Albrighi, Segati e C, 1940 xii + 577 pp L 15

—Tre saggi sulla poesia italiana del Rinascimento (Boiardo, Lorenzo, Ariosto) *Genova* Emiliano degli Orfini, 1939 408 pp L 25

Catalano, Michele (ed) — La Spagna Poema cavalleresco del secolo XIV, edito e illustrato da M C Voll II e III *Bologna* Commissione per i testi di lingua, 1940 400, 384 pp L 50 cad

Chiri, G.—La poesia epico-storica latina dell'Italia medioevale *Modena* Società tipografica modenese, 1939 138 pp L 35

Cimegotto, Cesare—Ruzzante *Padova* Coop tipografica, 1939 16 pp

Consoli, F G—Itinerario letterario Ricerche sulla Biblioteche napoletane del secolo XVII *Napoli* Ricciardi, 1939 179 pp

—Le raccolte di Classici italiani Saggio storico bibliografico *Napoli* Ricciardi, 1939 2 voll viii + 480 pp

Fogazzaro, A.—Lettere scelte, a cura di T Gallarati Scotti *Milano* Mondadori, 1940 750 pp con 7 ritratti e 3 autografi L 50

Galletti, Alfredo—Il Novecento (Storia letteraria d'Italia) 2a ediz riveduta ed aumentata *Milano* F Vallardi, 1939 xxiii + 677 pp L 70

Gnori Conti, Piero—Vita e opere di Pietro di Dante Alighieri, con documenti inediti *Firenze* Fondazione Gnori Conti, 1939 220 pp con tre tavole

Goldoni, C.—Tutte le opere, a cura di G Ortolani Vol IV *Milano* Mondadori, 1940 1792 pp leg L 60 (I classici Mondadori.)

Machiavelli, N.—Opere, a cura di A Panella.

Vol II Scritti politici *Milano* Rizzoli, 1940 1117 pp leg L 50

Pagano, Antonio.—Francesco Torraca Profilo e bibliografia *Nicotera* Ist edit calabrese, 1939 111 pp L 10

Pancrazi, P.—Studi su D'Annunzio *Torino* G Einaudi, 1939 146 pp L 12

Smith, W F—Masterpieces of Giacomo Leopardi, translated from the Italian *Menasha, Wis* G Banta, 1939

—The Barbarian Odes of G Carducci, translated from the Italian *Menasha, Wis* G Banta, 1939

Sonetti burleschi e realistici dei primi due secoli. Nuova edizione riveduta e aggiornata da Luigi Russo (Scrittori d'Italia) *Bari* Laterza, 1940 468 pp L 50

Sorbelli, Albano—Inventari dei manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia Vol LXXXI. *Trento* Firenze Olschki, 1940 280 pp L 80

—Storia dell'Università di Bologna Vol I Il Medio Evo *Bologna* Zanichelli, 1940 328 pp con 24 tavole fuori testo. L 25

Vico, Giambattista—Scritti vari e pagine sparse, a cura di F Nicolini (Scrittori d'Italia) *Bari* Laterza, 1940 300 pp L 35

Viscardi, Antonio.—Le origini (Storia letteraria d'Italia) *Milano* Vallardi, 1939 xxii + 575 pp L 70

## SPANISH

Castillo and Sparkman — España en América, segundas lecturas *Boston* Heath, 1940 viii + 115 pp

Martínez de Toledo.—El Arcipreste de Talavera o sea El Corbacho, ed L B Simpson *Berkeley* U of Cal Press, 1939 xi + 361 pp

Tiemann, H.—Lope de Vega in Deutschland *Hamburg* Lütcke & Wulff, 1939 xv + 310 pp

Vossler, Karl.—Südliche Romania *Munich* Oldenbourg, 1940. 249 pp

## GENERAL

Bradford, F. A.—The Legal Status of Branch Banking in the U S *American Economists Council* (1940) 32 pp

Erhardt-Siebold, E von, and R von Erhardt.—The Astronomy of Johannes Scotus Erigena *Poughkeepsie* Vassar College, 1940 69 pp \$1 50

Hinkle and Garodnick —Reading Knowledge Requirements and a translation service *Raleigh* U of N C, 1940. 18 pp

Reichenkron, G.—Beiträge zur romanischen Lautlehre *Leipzig*. Gronau, 1939 xiii + 198 pp

Thomson, S H.—Progress of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in the U S and Canada *Boulder* U of Col, 1940 85 pp (Bulletin 15.)

# Modern Language Notes

---

---

Volume LV

NOVEMBER, 1940

Number 7

---

---

## COPYHOLD TENURE AND *MACBETH*, III, II, 38

The menial work on a medieval English manor was largely done by the unfree serfs. These serfs, or *villains*, held small parcels of land at the will of the lord (he being able to dispossess them at any time), in return for which they performed labor services. Not only did the villeins perform menial services, but they were often personally unfree and subject to all the limitations of an unfree personal status.<sup>1</sup> In time, because of changed economic conditions, it became more advantageous to both the lord and the tenant to convert this labor-service system into a rent-paying system, so that unfree tenure became a form of property owning.<sup>2</sup>

It is generally stated by legal authorities that copyhold tenure, by which in 1584 a large part of the land in England was held,<sup>3</sup> grew out of tenure in villeinage.<sup>4</sup> The holding of land in villeinage had been regulated by the customs of the manor, and the rights of the tenant had been protected against all save the lord by the manorial court.<sup>5</sup> The services of the tenant and other customs of the manor relating to the lands were minutely set out in the records of the manorial court.<sup>6</sup> Thus, as the customs governing the hold-

<sup>1</sup> On the general subject of unfree tenants and their services, see I Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law*, 2nd ed. (hereinafter cited as "P & M"), pp. 358-375.

<sup>2</sup> Holdsworth, *History of English Law*, 3rd ed. (hereinafter cited as "Holdsworth"), p. 381, 3 *ibid.*, pp. 202-206.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, p. 209, citing Heydon's Case (1584), 3 Coke's *Reports*, f. 8 b, "For as much as great part of the land within the realm is in grant by copy."

<sup>4</sup> 3 Holdsworth, p. 206, 2 Blackstone's *Commentaries* (hereinafter cited as "Blackstone"), pp. 95, 98, Sir Edward Coke, *The Compleat Copyholder* (London, 1630) (hereinafter cited as *Comp Copyholder*), Sec. 32.

<sup>5</sup> 1 P & M, p. 361.

<sup>6</sup> 3 Holdsworth, pp. 200-201.

ings of villeins developed into property rights and personal bondage disappeared the tenure came to be known as *Copyhold* and the tenants came to be called *tenants by copy of court roll* because the tenant had no other evidence of his holding than a copy of the entries in the Court Roll witnessed by the steward.<sup>7</sup>

The tenants by copy of court roll did not hold their land at the arbitrary will of the lord, but at the will of the lord *according to the custom of the manor*.<sup>8</sup> Prior to the sixteenth century, however, the copyholder, holding by an unfree tenure, had no standing in the King's courts and his only protection was afforded by the manorial court,<sup>9</sup> presided over by the lord or his steward.<sup>10</sup> Thus, Littleton lays down the rule that if the lord ousts the copyholder the latter has no remedy other than to sue to the lord by petition, he adds, nevertheless, somewhat paradoxically, that "the lord cannot break the custom which is reasonable in these cases."<sup>11</sup>

In the latter half of the fifteenth century, about the time of writing and first publication of Littleton's *Tenures*, we begin to find dicta to the effect that the interest of the copyholder will be protected against the lord in the King's courts. In 1467 Danby, C. J., said "If the lord ousts his [copyhold] tenant he does him wrong, for his tenant is as well inheritor to have the land to him and his heirs according to the custom of the manor as any man is to have his lands at common law."<sup>12</sup> In 1481, Brian, C. J., answered the contention of counsel that if the lord ousted the copyholder the tenant had no remedy because he held at the will of the lord, by saying

That never was my opinion, and I believe never will be, for then every copyholder in England would be ousted, wherefore I understand that always

---

<sup>7</sup> Littleton's *Tenures* (hereinafter cited as "Littleton"), Sec 75, 2 Blackstone, p 95. But see *infra*, note 43.

<sup>8</sup> Littleton, Sec 73.

<sup>9</sup> 2 Holdsworth, pp 378-381, 3 *ibid*, p 206; Littleton, Sec 76.

<sup>10</sup> Williams *On Real Property* (24th ed.), p 548. It is apparently to this court that Jonson alludes in *The Staple of News*, iv, 1, ed Cunningham, p 267, when he has Picklock, after reciting a formidable list of land law terms, tell Pennyboy, Jr, that he will "Keep all your courts, be steward of your lands."

<sup>11</sup> Littleton, Sec 77.

<sup>12</sup> Year Book, 7 Edward IV, Michaelmas Term, placitum 16. See 3 Holdsworth, pp 208-9.

if he pays his customs and services, and the lord ousts him, he will have an action of trespass on the case against the lord <sup>18</sup>

While undoubtedly Littleton approved of these dicta, he does not state them as being the law.

In the sixteenth century the legal position of the copyholder was settled. The King's courts gave protection to the tenant against the lord. Chancery, the Court of Requests, and the Star Chamber were appealed to with respect to copyholds by both lords and tenants <sup>14</sup>. It was settled that if the lands were copyhold, the lords were compelled to observe the ancient customs of the manor with respect thereto <sup>15</sup>. Both lords and tenants were protected, however, for the rule was applied that no land was copyhold except by prescription, <sup>16</sup> i. e., copyhold tenure must arise, as Littleton said, by "a custom which hath been used time out of mind of man." <sup>17</sup> Indeed, the courts went even further than enforcing the ancient customs of the manor and applied standards of reasonableness with which the customs must comply <sup>18</sup>.

The position of the copyholder, therefore, became secure. So long as he performed the customary obligations he could not be dispossessed at the arbitrary will of the lord. In accordance with custom, the interest of the copyholder might be any of the common law estates, i. e., fee simple, fee tail, for life, etc. <sup>19</sup>. If he held an inheritable estate, upon his death his heir was admitted <sup>20</sup>. If he sold his interest the lord could be compelled to admit the purchaser <sup>21</sup>. Thus, Sir Edward Coke could write <sup>22</sup>

But now Copy-holders stand upon a sure ground, now they weigh not their Lords displeasure, they shake not at every suddaine blast of wind, they eate, drinke, and sleepe securely, onely having a speciall care of the maineance (*viz*) to performe carefully what duties and services soever their Tenure doth exact, and Custome doth require, then let Lord frowne, the Copy-holder cares not, knowing himselfe safe, and not within any danger, for if the Lords anger grow to expulsion, the Law hath provided severall weapons of remedy, for it is at his election, either to sue a *Subpena*

<sup>18</sup> Year Book, 21 Edward IV, Michaelmas Term, placitum 27. See 3 Holdsworth, p. 209.

<sup>14</sup> 3 Holdsworth, p. 211.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>17</sup> Littleton, Sec 73.

<sup>18</sup> 7 Holdsworth, pp. 296-304, *Comp Copy-holder*, Sec 33.

<sup>19</sup> Littleton, Sec 73.

<sup>21</sup> *Comp Copy-holder*, Sec 39.

<sup>20</sup> Williams *On Real Property*, p. 563.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid*, Sec 9.

or an Action of Trespasse against the Lord Time hath dealt very favourably with Copy-holders in divers respects

Probably on account of the fact that villein tenure had disappeared in England by the time of the Elizabethan dramatists,<sup>23</sup> it seldom appears in the plays. Of course, the term "villain" is often employed, but it usually seems to have been used in a derogatory sense without any relation to the land law. John Webster is the only dramatist of the period who refers definitely to villein tenure<sup>24</sup> in its legal sense, with the implication of a personally unfree status, and he is certainly aware of the fact that it did not exist in practice at the time he was writing.

Copyholds, on the other hand, frequently appear in the plays, being referred to by Beaumont and Fletcher,<sup>25</sup> Jonson,<sup>26</sup> Webster,<sup>26</sup> Greene,<sup>27</sup> Dekker,<sup>28</sup> Middleton,<sup>29</sup> and Massinger.<sup>30</sup> In these legal allusions, the term (with due allowance for Elizabethan spelling) appears six times as "copyhold" or "copyholder," five times it is contracted into "copy," and once it appears as "copy of court roll."

Whatever its form, its use is equally varied. Jonson mentions "copy of court roll" in a catalogue of legalisms relating to real estate.<sup>31</sup> Most often the term is used in a figurative sense and only twice is there a clear reference to land held by copyhold tenure, although occasionally the word "land" or its equivalent is coupled

<sup>23</sup> Reeves, *History of the English Law*, p. 312, 3 Holdsworth, pp. 205-206

<sup>24</sup> *A Cure for a Cuckold*, ed. Lucas (N. Y., 1928), III, 1, 80-84

*Lessingham* You may see, Sir,  
Although the Tenure by which Land was held  
In Villenage be quite extinct in England,  
Yet you have women there at this day living,  
Make a number of slaves

<sup>25</sup> Ed. Dyce, London, 1843-1846 *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, III, iv, p. 190, *The Scornful Lady*, IV, 1, p. 70, *What Without Money*, II, iv, p. 126, *ibid.*, IV, 1, p. 157

<sup>26</sup> *The Staple of News*, I, 1, p. 163, *ibid.*, IV, 1, p. 267

<sup>26</sup> *A Cure for a Cuckold*, III, 11, 20-25

<sup>27</sup> Ed. J. Churton Collins *Frier Bacon*, III, 111, 1369-70

<sup>28</sup> Pearson Reprint *The Honest Whore, Part I*, Sc. xii, pp. 78-79

<sup>29</sup> Ed. Dyce *Women Beware Women*, III, 1, p. 568, *The Family of Love*, v, 111, p. 200

<sup>30</sup> Ed. Gifford *The City Madam*, II, 11, p. 36

<sup>31</sup> *The Staple of News*, IV, 1, p. 267

with "copy" in a figure of speech Suffice this for a general analysis of this group of allusions Some of them, however, are interesting enough to warrant special comment, and in a few cases prior commentators have made it necessary

Fletcher<sup>32</sup> and Middleton<sup>33</sup> allude to a distinction between copyhold and freehold They do not, however, state the nature of any distinction,—in fact it is only from the context that we are aware that the two are being contrasted The most that we can say, therefore, is that apparently they knew there was some distinction This is the more interesting because as the security of the copyholder developed the distinction became more and more tenuous, so that Coke, a contemporary legal scholar, could write " . . . time hath bred such an alteration, that in the point of service, a man can scarce discern any difference betweene Free-hold Lands, and Copy-hold Lands"<sup>34</sup>

Fletcher also speaks of selling copyholds.<sup>35</sup> We have seen that copyholds were subject to alienation<sup>36</sup> This in itself is an indication of the security of the tenant They were not, however, transferred by the same methods as freehold estates. The copyholder "surrendered" his land to the lord of the manor to the use of the purchaser, and the lord then "admitted" the purchaser This the lord could be compelled to do, for as Coke said, "In Admittances upon surrender, the Lord to no intent is reputed as owner, but wholly as an instrument . . ."<sup>37</sup>

Beaumont and Fletcher, in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*,<sup>38</sup> have the Second Man say

I am a *Londoner*,  
Free by my Copy

This may be an allusion to the fact that, although copyhold was an unfree tenure, men who were personally free held by it, and it might be added that in the days of villein tenure, before the development of copyholds, free men sometimes held in villeinage<sup>39</sup> Dekker turns a pun on the same idea in *The Honest Whore, Part I*<sup>40</sup>

<sup>32</sup> *Wit Without Money*, II, IV, p 126

<sup>33</sup> *The Family of Love*, V, III, p 200

<sup>34</sup> *Comp Copy-holder*, Sec 7

<sup>35</sup> *Wit Without Money*, IV, I, p 157

<sup>36</sup> 2 Holdsworth, pp 264, 577, Littleton, Secs 172, 174

<sup>40</sup> Sc XIII, pp 78-79 (Mermaid ed V, II, p 177)

<sup>36</sup> See *supra*, p 484

<sup>37</sup> *Comp Copy-holder*, Sec. 41

<sup>38</sup> III, IV, p 180

Sweeper                citizens'  
 sons and heirs are free of the house by  
 their fathers' copy

Here it is clear from other parts of the speech that the antithetical meaning was that they were "free of the house" inherited from their fathers by selling it

Because of the fact that the word "copy" is used in several senses by the dramatists, it constitutes a veritable trap for the commentator. For example, in addition to meaning "copyhold," the word "copy" may mean (1) the result of imitation, such as facsimile, likeness, portrait, duplicate, replica, or reproduction, or (2) a thing to be copied, such as a pattern, model, original, paragon, or archetype. The result is that not only do we find disagreement among the commentators, but some of their explanations are rather curious.

Thus, it seems to us, Lieut. Col. Cunningham went astray in his note<sup>41</sup> on "copy" as used by Jonson in *The Alchemist*,<sup>42</sup> V, 111. In this scene Kastil upbraids his sister, Dame Phant, for her marriage to Lovewit. Lovewit intervenes and offers to fight. Kastil then sings another tune: "This is a fine old boy as e'er I saw." Lovewit then says:

What, do you change your copy now? proceed,  
 Here stands my dove stoop at her, if you dare

Cunningham recognized that here "copy" did not mean "copyhold."

Jonson generally employs this word for *plenty* or *abundance*, like the Latin *copia*, but here, as it seems to me, it is used rather in the printer's sense of *exemplar to be copied*. See *News from the New World discovered in the Moon*, Vol. VII, p. 335. And Chapman in *Monsieur D'Olive*, A I, p. 199, "We shall have you change your copy ere a twelve months day." In this way "copy" certainly means the "original."<sup>43</sup>

<sup>41</sup> *Works of Ben Jonson* (London, 1875), iv, 534.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, iv, 178.

<sup>43</sup> He then adds the somewhat ambiguous statement: "And I am inclined to think that Blackstone has mistaken the derivation of the word *copyhold*." Blackstone says: "And, as such tenants had nothing to shew for their estates but these customs, and admissions in pursuance of them, entered on those rolls, or the copies of such entries witnessed by the steward, they now began to be called *tenants by copy of court roll*, and their tenure itself a *copyhold*." (2 Blackstone, p. 95.) Apparently Cuning-

Now, the phrase "to change (or alter) one's copy" was an expression current in Jonson's day, meaning to change one's style, tone, behavior, or course of action, or to assume another character.<sup>44</sup> Jonson, therefore, was not using a metaphor derived from the print-shop meaning the "original" or "manuscript," but, in the idiom of his day, simply had Lovewit ask, as we would say to-day, "Do you change your tune?"

Another rather strained explanation is to be found in Mr F L Lucas's note<sup>45</sup> on "Corry-hold" as used by Webster in *A Cure for a Cuckold*, III, 1, 24. In this scene the Nurse refuses to permit Compass to see the child born to his wife. She tells Compass that he is not the father of the child and she under orders from the actual father. The following colloquy then ensues:

*Comp* Why thou white Bastard-breeder, is not this the mother?

*Nurse* Yes, I grant you that

*Comp* Dost thou? and I grant it too. And is not the Childe mine own  
then by the wifes *Corry-hold*?

Mr Lucas explains that Compass is the lord of the manor, the wife is his tenant, and the child her holding, of which Compass can claim possession, since she, as a copyholder, holds at the will of the lord.

Obviously the word "Corry-hold" is related in some way to copyhold tenure. We think, however, that Mr Lucas spins his interpretation too fine, and it is not entirely in accord with the state of law at the time or with the scene as written by Webster. Essential to Mr Lucas's exposition is the right of the lord to oust the tenant and take possession at any time. But we have seen that in Webster's day copyholds were not so precarious. Furthermore, Compass is not claiming any rights to the exclusion of his wife, but only as against the father of the child.

At the risk of inviting the same criticism we have charged to Mr Lucas, namely overrefinement, we venture to suggest the following explanation of this obscure usage. Webster is here using "Corry-hold" in a double sense, a frequent device in this scene. The child is admittedly the wife's but not Compass', so he refers to it as her *likeness*, hence her "Corry-hold". At the same time, he likens the

ham means that Blackstone errs in referring to a duplicate of the entries on the rolls rather than to the "original" only.

<sup>44</sup> See *NED*, *sub nom* "copy".

<sup>45</sup> *The Complete Works of John Webster* (New York, 1928), III, 106.





word as being representative of the "copyhold school" and state our reasons for disagreement Professor Kittredge says <sup>48a</sup>

Nature has granted them, not a perpetual lease of life but a mere copyhold tenure, easy to revoke or to terminate Cf Middleton, *Women Beware Women*, III, 1, 59 'By that copy this land still I hold' Copyhold tenure was originally tenure at the will of the lord of the manor The tenant had no deed or lease, his sole evidence was a copy of an entry or entries in the roll of the manorial court This interpretation of the passage is confirmed by frequent reference to copyhold (literal and figurative) in the Elizabethan dramatists (including Greene, Jonson, Chapman, Fletcher, Middleton, and Dekker), as well as by the figure of a cancelled bond in II 48-50, and by 'live the lease of nature' in IV, 1, 99 A less probable explanation regards Banquo and Fleance as Nature's copies (or specimens) of mankind, formed by Nature according to model—'particular casts from Nature's mould' (Knight) Such copies are, of course, not indestructible A passage in Massinger (*The Fatal Dowry*, IV, 1) suggests that he took the words in this sense

'Put it [the mirror] by,  
Lest thou, dear lord, Narcissus-like shouldst dote  
Upon thyself, and die, and rob the world  
Of Nature's copy that she works form by'

Our reasons for disagreement are

1 It is essential to this interpretation, in order to be consistent with the sense of the entire passage, to view copyholds as being subject to arbitrary termination But as we have seen, this was not the case, so that this explanation is not in conformity with the state of the law in Shakespeare's day Kittredge himself implies as much by saying that copyhold tenure was *originally* at the will of the lord.

2 This difficulty is not cured, as Ritson <sup>49</sup> evidently intended, by saying: "The allusion is to an *estate for lives* held by *copy of court roll*," because (a) the word used by Shakespeare is general, not specific as Ritson restricts it, (b) this reading destroys the idea of arbitrary termination which is essential to the copyhold theory in order to be consistent with the meaning of the passage—and essential also for Macbeth's peace of mind, and (c) it makes the tail wag the dog in that it makes the enjoyment of the copyhold dependent upon the continuance of the life of the tenant rather than preserving the major premise of the theory, namely the similar uncertainty of life and a copyhold.

<sup>48a</sup> *Macbeth* (New York, 1939), p 165

<sup>49</sup> See Furness, *op cit*, p 156, n 38

3. This explanation is not confirmed, as Kittredge asserts, by Macbeth's subsequent speech,

our high plac'd Macbeth  
Shall live the lease of nature<sup>50</sup>

Copyholds and leases, or terms for years, were certainly different and it is difficult to see how a use of the latter could confirm the former. Furthermore, the two figures are opposed. A lease generally has a definite time for determination. It is to this feature of a lease for years that Shakespeare alludes in this "lease of nature." Macbeth here is saying that he will live until his appointed time, and his life will not be cut short by the assassin's hand. This is the opposite of Lady Macbeth's meaning.

4. Neither is this interpretation confirmed, as Kittredge says, "by frequent reference to copyhold (literal and figurative) in the Elizabethan drama." Although the dramatists mentioned by him, except Chapman,<sup>51</sup> refer to copyhold, literally and figuratively, not one of them, even figuratively, refers to it as being terminable at the absolute will of the lord. Webster's usage in *A Cure for a Cuckold* is the only possible exception and we believe we have demonstrated that even here such is not the meaning.<sup>52</sup>

If it were true that Shakespeare used the word "copy" in this passage from *Macbeth* as an allusion to an inherent uncertainty of duration of copyhold tenure, then his usage is not only unique among the Elizabethan dramatists, but also he alone is in error.

5. Shakespeare does not use the terms copyhold or copy of court roll at all. He uses "copy" or "copies" eleven times in the plays and once in the sonnets, in addition to this instance in *Macbeth*. In every instance (omitting that in *Macbeth*) the meaning is either (a) a thing to be copied, or (b) the result of imitation, or some variation thereof. If the maxim *noscitur a sociis* may be applied, he does not refer to copyhold by the word "copy" in this passage from *Macbeth*.

6. The champions of the "copyhold school," however, may reply that the fact that copyholds were not terminable at the absolute will

<sup>50</sup> IV, 1, 98-99

<sup>51</sup> So far as we can see, Chapman does not use "copy" in the sense of copyhold. Cf. his usage in *Monsieur D'Olve*, *supra*, p. 488.

<sup>52</sup> See *supra*, p. 489.

of the lord in Shakespeare's day is immaterial, and that the problem should be viewed from the time of the action presented in the play. There are two answers to this: (a) The time of the action presented, according to Holinshed's *Chronicle*, upon which the play is based, is from 1040 to 1054. This was before the Norman Conquest and before the development of copyhold tenure. (b) Even if it were true that copyholds were terminable at the will of the lord, the "copyhold interpretation" would not fit the passage. Applying it, Banquo and Fleance would be the tenants and *Nature would be the lord*. Macbeth then would have no right to terminate the tenure, and it would be no comfort to him that Nature might at some time do so.

Therefore, after reviewing the state of the law with respect to copyholds, the context of the passage, the usage of the word "copy" by other dramatists and by Shakespeare himself in other instances, we are compelled to conclude that he does not here allude to copyhold tenure.<sup>53</sup>

PAUL S. CLARKSON  
CLYDE T. WARREN

*Baltimore, Maryland*

---

## UN SONNET DE WILLIAM DRUMMOND ET SON POINT DE DEPART DANS "LA SEMAINE" DE DU BARTAS

Peut-être pour avoir pratiqué leurs recherches *de sonnettiste en sonnettiste* et attribué aux *genres* une importance dont n'ont que faire l'inspiration et la suggestion, Sidney Lee et L. E. Kastner semblent avoir négligé le point de départ évident d'un beau sonnet de William Drummond of Hawthornden. On lit dans *la Semaine, Premier Jour*, vers 151 de l'édition en 3 volumes *The Works of Guillaume De Salluste Sieur Du Bartas*. Chapel Hill, II, 200.

<sup>53</sup> The authors of this article have recently completed an exhaustive examination of law in the Elizabethan drama. Having collected and studied some nine thousand passages, they are now ready to publish the first of several projected volumes. The above article is an extract from their manuscript on the law of real property in the Elizabethan drama. Among the most interesting conclusions is the demonstration that about half the other dramatists employ legal allusions more freely than Shakespeare, and that, with a very few exceptions, their degree of accuracy is at least no lower than his.—THE EDITORS

Le monde est un grand livre, ou du souverain maistre  
 L'admirable artifice on list en grosse lettre  
 Chasque œuvre est une page, et chasque sien effect  
 Est un beau caractere en tous ses traits parfaict  
 Mais tous tels que l'enfant qui se paist dans l'eschole,  
 Pour l'estude des arts, d'un estude frivole,  
 Nostre œil admire tant ses marges peintuiez,  
 Son cuir fleurdelize, et ses bords sur-dorez,  
 Que rien il ne nous chaud d'apprendre la lecture  
 De ce texte disoit, ou la docte nature  
 Enseigne aux plus grossiers qu'une Divinité  
 Police de ses loix ceste ionde Cite  
 Pour lire la dedans il ne nous faut entendre  
 Cent sortes de jargons, il ne nous faut apprendre  
 Les caracteres tures  
 L'enfant qui n'a sept ans, le chassieux vieillard  
 Y lit passablement, bien que despourveu d'art

Et le poète chrétien insiste sur l'intelligence plus éclairée à qui la Foi permet de "comprendre le grand Moteur de tous ces mouvemens"

Son lecteur Écossais maintient plus longtemps l'image heureuse à peine développée par le Français c'est l'enfantillage frivole plus que le sérieux de la croyance qu'il va pousser ingénieusement plus loin <sup>1</sup>

Of this fair volume which we World do name  
 If we the sheets and leaves could turn with care,  
 Of Him who it corrects, and did it frame,  
 We clear might read the art and wisdom rare  
 Find out His power which wildest powers doth tame,  
 His providence extending everywhere,  
 His justice which proud rebels doth not spare,  
 In every page, no period of the same  
 But silly we, like foolish children, rest  
 Well pleased with color'd vellum, leaves of gold,  
 Fair dangling ribbands, leaving what is best,  
 On the great Writer's sense ne'er taking hold,  
 Or if by chance we stay our minds on aught,  
 It is some picture on the margin wrought

Avec grande raison, L. E. Kastner dans ses notes rappelle un sonnet de Marino (*Rime*, 1602) et surtout des analogies éparses d'*Astrophel et Stella* et de l'*Arcadie* de Sidney. La priorité chrono-

<sup>1</sup> Pour l'orthographe correcte—et archaïque—voir *The Poetical Works of William Drummond of Hawthornden*, edited by L. E. Kastner, Manchester, 1913, II, 8 *The Booke of the World*

logique ne faisant pas doute, c'est bien, semble-t-il, à la Muse chrétienne de *la Semaine* qu'il faut attribuer l'inspiration première de ces autres poètes

Une coïncidence comme il s'en trouve beaucoup dans l'histoire de la traduction—qui attend son historien complet—ayant amené l'auteur de cet article à donner une version française du sonnet de Drummond, on l'excusera de la citer ici, comme une sorte de restitution ou de retour à l'original—et cependant le jeu des rimes lui-même n'est pas le même que chez Du Bartas

De ce Livre excellent qu'on nomme l'Univers  
Si nous tournions soigneusement feuillets et pages,  
Celui qui le corrige et sertit ses images  
Ferait voir sa Sagesse et son Art grands ouverts  
Pouvoir, que nul Rival n'aura pris à revers,  
Providence, étendue aux plus lointains parages,  
Justice, qu'ont bravée en vain de fiers outrages,  
S'attestent dans ce Livre en mille aspects divers  
Mais dans notre folie, ah ! jeunesse peu mûres,  
Nous goûtons le velin colore, les dorures  
Les beaux cordons dansants—négligeant le parfait  
L'intention du grand Esprit reste cachée,  
Ou bien si, par hasard, nous frappe quelque objet,  
C'est une enluminure, aux maigres ébauchées<sup>1</sup>

FERNAND BALDENSPERGER

Harvard University

## LE STYLE 'CIRCULAIRE'

Dans mon compte-rendu (*MLN* LIII, 606) de l'édition Nitzsche du *Perlesvaus* ou *Haut livre du Graal* j'ai signalé un procédé de style propre à l'auteur que j'appelais le 'cercle spirituel,' c'est à dire ce tour de la phrase terminant en mots ou idées employés au commencement et qui forme un cadre, symbolisant, par exemple, la complétude de la Trinité

*Les hautz livres du Graal* commence o non du Pere et du Fill et du Saint Esperit Ces trois personnes sont une sustance, e cele sustance si est Dex, et de Dieu si muet li hautz contes du Graal, e tuit cil qui l'oent le doivent entendre,

<sup>1</sup> D'Edmond Spenser à Alan Seeger : cent petits Poemes anglais traduits en vers français Cambridge (Mass.), 1938, p. 18

mais aussi encadrant une énumération (d'abord les chevaliers *morurent tuit a armes por avancier la loi qui renovelee estout*, puis *tuit cist morurent a armes o service du Saint Prophete qui avoit renovelee la Loi par sa mort*)

Ce patron de phrases et d'idées chiasique, que je considérerais comme "éminemment esthétique" et qui me semblait relever du sentiment de l'équilibre, de la complétude et perfection inhérentes à l'idée du cercle, je l'avais trouvé d'une façon empirique, par la simple observation. Or, en lisant un de ces jours l'article lumineux que vient de publier M. F. Rauhut dans *Revista de filología hispánica* 1, 235 seq., traitant de l'influence du roman picaresque espagnol sur le même genre en Allemagne et particulièrement sur le *Simplicissimus* de Grimmelshausen, je fus frappé—combien les choses les plus éloignées dans l'espace et dans le temps sont reliées entre elles si l'on en scrute la nature profonde!—par la remarque de M. Rauhut statuant à la p. 248, que le *Simplicissimus* ainsi que le *Parzival* de Wolfram von Eschenbach sont bâtis sur un plan circulaire,—l'évolution du héros se réalisant dans un cercle qui commence par Dieu, principe de l'être, le conduit vers le monde et la réjouissance et le fait retourner à Dieu et à la méditation de ce principe,—et que cette 'pensée circulaire' est l'apanage des mystiques. Le mystique allemand du XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle Henri Seuse a dessiné ce 'départ de la créature de Dieu et son retour vers Dieu' sous forme (approximativement) d'un cercle qui relie les différentes étapes de la carrière de la créature et commence et finit dans le coeur du Christ (lui-même figuré par un cercle situé au milieu de son corps, comme le coeur des différents 'hommes' qui représentent les étapes de 'l'homme'—c'est que la vie du Christ forme elle-même un cercle comme celle de l'humanité: descente dans la chair—retour à la divinité).

M. Rauhut renvoie au livre de Hans Leisegang, "Denkformen" (1928). Là on trouve, outre la reproduction du dessein de Seuse, des phrases circulaires reflétant l'idée du cercle mystique, comme par exemple

car la *trinité* des personnes réside dans l'*unité* de la nature, et l'*unité* de la nature réside dans la *trinité* des personnes. L'*unité* a son efficacité dans la *trinité*, et la *trinité* a sa puissance dans l'*unité*, comme dit Saint Augustin dans son livre sur la Trinité. dans l'effluence (*Ausfluss*) de la créature à partir de la première origine il y a une inflexion

circulaire vers le commencement (*zirkelrundes Wiederbeugen des Endes auf den Anbeginn*)

Et M. Leisegang cite des passages circulaires et chiastiques d'Augustin, de l'Evangile selon Saint Jean (In principio erat *verbum*, et *verbum* erat apud Deum, et Deus erat *verbum*), de Saint Paul (*ad Rom* v, 12-13 Propterea sicut per unum hominem *peccatum* in hunc mundum intravit, et per *peccatum mors*, et ita in omnes homines *mors* pertransiit, in quo omnes *peccaverunt* Usque ad *legem* enim *peccatum* erit in mundo *peccatum* autem non imputabatur, cum *lex* non esset), et il remonte jusqu'à Héraclite et sa *παλίντροπος ἁρμονία*

*ψυχῆσιν θάνατος ὕδωρ γενέσθαι, ὕδατι δὲ θάνατος γῆν γενέσθαι,*  
*ἐκ γῆς δὲ ὕδωρ γίνεταί, ἐξ ὕδατος δὲ ψυχή*

M. Norden dans son "Theos Agnostos" (1913) avait déjà relevé dans un fragment orphique une phrase comme *ἐν δὲ τὰ πάντα τέτυκται ἐν ᾧ τάδε πάντα κυκλείται* et avait reproduit au frontispice une vignette tirée d'un ms grec traitant d'alchimie et représentant un serpent dont la bouche mord la queue, avec l'inscription *ἐν τὸ πᾶν*, et les mêmes mots, un peu allongés (*ἐν τὸ πᾶν καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ πᾶν*), se trouvent comme légende sur un 'anneau (1) magique' reproduit dans ce même ms, mots, selon Norden, concordant avec la doxologie de Saint Paul Si Martial nous parle de *Hermes omnia solus et ter unus* (Norden, p. 246), nous sommes très près des spéculations médiévales (juives-kabbalistiques et chrétiennes) sur *Hermes Trismegistus* et la Trinité, qui aboutissent à la formule que Dante applique au dieu Amour "ego tamquam centrum *circuli*, cui simili modo se habent circumferentiae partes," comme l'a montré M. F. Beck, *Ztschr f rom Phil* LVII, 36 seq (et cf mes remarques dans *Travaux du sém de phil rom*, Istanbul 1937, p. 134), et qui a été appliquée par Seuse, Marguerite de Navarre, Rabelais et Pascal soit à Dieu soit à la Nature—les alchimistes donnent la main aux mystiques, naturellement, puisque l'alchimie n'est que la variante vitaliste, organique, mystique de la chimie (Leisegang, p. 339<sup>1</sup>)

M. Austin dans un excellent article "From Matter to Spirit" (*MLN*, XXXVIII, 140 seq), en relevant la définition, par Dante,

<sup>1</sup> Le serpent des Égyptiens (Orionboros) qui se mord la queue est devenu au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle un symbole alchimique, v. A.-M. Schmidt, *La poésie scientifique en France au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 193



*Par.* xxx, 12, du point infinitésimal qui forme le centre d'attraction des cieux par la coincidentia oppositorum *parendo inchiuso da quel ch' ell' 'nchiude* (un point-cercle'), a indiqué le mouvement circulaire des idées et des mots dans des passages comme *Par* xiv, 1

Dal centro al cerchio, e sì dal cerchio al centro,  
 Movesi l'acqua in un rtondo vaso  
 (Discours de Salomon, *ibid.*, 38)      il nostro amore  
 Si raggera d'intorno cotai vesta  
 La sua chiarezza seguirà l'ardore,  
 L'ardor la visione, e quella è tanta,  
 Quanta ha di grazia sopra il suo valore  
 Per che s'accrescerà ciò che ne dona  
 Di gratuito lume il Sommo Bene,  
 Lume ch' a lui veder ne condiziona  
 Onde la vision crescer conviene,  
 Crescer l'ardor che di quella s'accende,  
 Crescer lo raggio che da esso viene

et particulièrement dans une définition de la Trinité, *ibid.*, 28

Quell' uno e due e tre che sempre vive,  
 E regna sempre in tre e due ed uno,  
 Non circoscritto, e tutto circoscrive (donc = un cercle).

M Austin dans *PMLA*, XLVII, 1 (article sur lequel M Singleton a attiré mon attention), parle de la réponse que donne à l' "Ave" de l'ange cette Vierge qui est une Eva 'renversée,' par des mots (*ecce ancilla dei*) que les peintres médiévaux écrivent par caractères *reversed* ("Mary was enabled to undo, that is to reverse, what had been done to humanity's hurt by disobedient Eva"—indication non pas du cercle magique, comme dit M Austin, mais du cercle de l'histoire de l'humanité évoluant entre les pôles *Eva-Ave*) D'une façon générale, M Austin est disposé à voir dans ces *reversions* dantesques une pensée évoluée qui verrait la matière d'en dehors—sans nier ce point de vue, j'insisterais aussi sur le cercle indiquant la complétude par exemple le chiasme du passage sur la Trinité ne peut pas être détaché des passages cités par Norden qui traduisent la même idée par la même expression

M Leisegang oppose cette forme de pensée 'circulaire' et mystique qui caractérise Héraclite, Saint Paul, Simon le Mage, Eriugena, Nicolas de Cuse (coincidentia oppositorum), Augustin, Seuse, Hegel etc., à la pensée 'pyramidale' („Denkpyramide“) et rationaliste

qui caractérise Démocrite, Aristote et Platon, les scolastiques, Kant tandis que les 'mystiques' voient dans le monde un organisme dans lequel la vie mène à la mort et la mort à la vie, le particulier suppose le tout, le devenir s'écoule entre le A et le  $\Omega$ , les rationalistes envisagent plutôt une architecture rationnelle où l'on monte par une abstraction systématique du plus particulier au plus général— de sorte que leur système philosophique aboutit à la pyramide



Ce qui nous intéresse ici, ce n'est pas le classement pour ainsi dire psycho-biologique des penseurs de l'humanité en deux groupes bien délimités (*Kreisdenker-Pyramidendenker*, avec des "types mixtes" faisant la navette entre elles), mais l'attraction qu'exerce sur la pensée mystique et 'organique' la forme du cercle. Ce ne sera pas le hasard qui aura trois fois fait représenter, dans *Perlesvaus*, chez Seuse et Dante la Trinité, qui est un principe  $\epsilon\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ , par la forme circulaire de la phrase. Il y a en plus de l'affinité de tous les 'mystiques' au sens large de Leisegang (qui inclut Lao-Tse et Bouddha), une tradition mystique bien définie dans l'occident chrétien, qui se traduit dans ce symbolisme syntaxique et dégénère dans le *Perlesvaus* à une grammaticalisation affectant même de banales énumérations (qui pourtant sont annoblies par ce patron figurant la perfection) nous pouvons saisir ici une 'influence' d'une *pensée* sur un *style*—ou plutôt la consubstantialité, l'identité profonde d'un *style* et d'une *pensée*.

LEO SPITZER

## ROUSSEAU, MELON, AND SIR WILLIAM PETTY<sup>1</sup>

In Rousseau's *Discours sur les sciences et les arts* (1750) is a somewhat curious passage, one of several in which he attacks modern defense of luxury as against the virtues attributed to the austere and simple life. He says

Les anciens politiques parloient sans cesse de mœurs et de vertu, les nôtres ne parlent que de commerce et d'argent. L'un vous dira qu'un homme vaut en telle contrée la somme qu'on le vendroit à Alger, un autre, en suivant ce calcul, trouvera des pays où un homme ne vaut rien, et

<sup>1</sup> For lending me the volumes of Sir William Petty's works and for most cordial help in locating relevant passages, I am very greatly indebted to my colleague, Professor A. B. Wolfe, of the department of Economics.

d'autres où il vaut moins que rien. Ils évaluent les hommes comme des troupeaux de bétail. Selon eux, un homme ne vaut à l'Etat que la consommation qu'il y fait, ainsi un Sybarite auroit bien valu trente Lacédémoniens.<sup>2</sup>

Where did Rousseau come upon this method of considering man in terms of his economic consumption? Whence did he draw the reference to the value of a man as equal to the price of an Algerian slave?

A well-known French defense of luxury in the eighteenth century is the *Essai politique sur le commerce* of Jean-François Melon, first published in 1734 and further developed in a second edition in 1736. Rousseau knew Melon's work to which he directly refers in his *Dernière Réponse*. A. M. Bordes, published in May 1752 as a defense of the position taken in the famous First Discourse<sup>3</sup> of two years before. Now Melon in his essay had developed in detail a method of computing the "value of a man," quoting from the seventeenth-century English economist, Sir William Petty:

Le Chevalier Guillaume Petti, Anglois, est le premier qui a voulu calculer la puissance d'un Etat, & la Politique du Commerce. Son Livre intitulé *l'Arithmétique Politique*, Ouvrage posthume, a été imprimé en 1691.<sup>4</sup> Le fruit qu'on peut tirer de cet ouvrage, c'est d'y trouver une manière de calcul pour les valeurs des terres, des hommes, de la navigation.<sup>5</sup>

After this reference to Petty, Melon comes back to the subject a few pages later and explains in detail:

Le prix du travail de chaque homme peut être calculé, & de tous les travaux différens, il peut se faire un prix commun qui appréciera ce que vaut à l'Etat un Travailleur. Le Chevalier Petti le propose d'une manière qui semble être plus de spéculation que de pratique instructive. Il suppose six millions<sup>6</sup> d'habitans en Angleterre, & que chaque habitant dépense sept livres sterling, ce qui fait quarante-deux millions de dépense annuelle. Il suppose aussi que le Revenu des terres n'est que de huit millions, celui des charges & des bénéfices, de dix millions. Il reste vingt-six millions tous les ans, qui doivent être gagnés par l'industrie. De là pour apprécier la valeur

<sup>2</sup> Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Ouvres*, Hachette, I, 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 64-65.

<sup>4</sup> The "Five Essays in Political Arithmetick" first appeared in 1687, the title "Political Arithmetick" was given to the edition of 1690. Cf. Charles Henry Hull, *The Economic Writings of Sir William Petty*, Cambridge (England), 1899, 2 vols. Vol II, pp. 644-46.

<sup>5</sup> J.-F. Melon, *Essai politique sur le commerce*, nouv. éd., [s. l.], 1736, p. 321.

d'un homme, il suppose la vie commune de vingt ans il multiplie les vingt-six millions de profits, par vingt, qui est la vie de l'homme le produit est de cinq cens vingt millions, & en divisant ce produit par six millions, nombre des habitans, il trouve pour quotient quatre-vingt livres sterling, valeur de chaque habitant <sup>7</sup>

Here follows the passage in Sir William Petty's *Political Arithmetick* from which Melon has drawn

I shall here digress to set down the way of computing the value of every Head one with another, and that by the instance of People in England, *viz* Suppose the People of England be Six Millions in number, that their expense at 7 l per Head be forty two Millions suppose also that the Rent of the Lands be eight Millions, and the profit of all the Personal Estate be Eight Millions more, it must needs follow, that the Labour of the People must have supplied the remaining Twenty Six Millions, the which multiplied by Twenty (the Mass of Mankind being worth Twenty Years purchase as well as Land) makes Five Hundred and Twenty Millions, as the value of the whole People which number divided by Six Millions, makes above 80 l Sterling, to be valued of each Head of Man, Woman, and Child, and of adult Persons twice as much <sup>8</sup>

Apart from the discrepancy of Melon's "dix millions" where Petty gives "Eight Millions" <sup>9</sup> as the "profit of all the Personal Estate," Melon reproduces Petty accurately

But, if Melon, based on Petty, appears to offer the direct background of Rousseau's scornful reference to those who evaluate men "comme des troupeaux de bétail," Sir William Petty alone, it seems, gives the value of a man in terms of an Algerian slave. Thus

Having proved that there die about 3506 Persons at Paris unnecessarily to the damage of France, we come next to compute the value of the said damage and of the Remedy thereof, as follows, *viz* the value of the said 3506 at 60 l. Sterling per head, being about the value of Argier <sup>10</sup> Slaves (which is less than the intrinsic value of People at Paris)

<sup>7</sup> "Sans l'Ecosse & l'Irlande" *Ibid*, p 338

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, pp 338 39

<sup>9</sup> *The Economic Writings of Sir William Petty*, Hull ed, I, 267

<sup>10</sup> Eugène Daire, in his *Economistes financiers du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (2nd ed, Paris, Guillaumin, 1851, p 760, n 3), noticed a discrepancy in Melon's figures, but made the mistake of changing the "26 millions" to "24 millions" in order to make the final quotient come out even at "80 livres sterling" A comparison with Petty would have shown the real error in Melon as given in the text above Petty's division of Six Millions into Five Hundred and Twenty is not incorrect, since he gives the quotient only in round numbers as "above 80 l Sterling"

<sup>11</sup> Read *Algier* for *Argier*, says Hull, *op cit*, I, p lxxi, n 7

This passage occurs in a work entitled "*An Essay in Political Arithmetick*," by Sir William Petty, Tending to Prove that in the Hospital *L'hostel Dieu* at Paris, there die above 3000 *per Annum* by reason of ill accommodation"<sup>11</sup> According to Petty's editor, Hull, this essay seems to have appeared first in French, though published at London, in 1686, before the English edition of 1687<sup>12</sup> Since Petty openly argued in favor of the supposed superiority of the economic power of England as against France, it would be only natural if his works attracted some attention, unfavorable attention, in the country across the Channel

While Rousseau knew Melon's work directly, it is uncertain how Petty's reference to the price of Algerian slaves came to his attention Perhaps Melon's detailed account led Rousseau to look up Petty's work or at least to inquire about him There is a reference to Petty in John Law,<sup>13</sup> but there is no evidence that Rousseau read it, nor was it couched in terms at all striking The Abbé de Saint-Pierre, whom Rousseau probably saw at Chenonceaux in 1742<sup>14</sup> and whose works he was to try to abstract later,<sup>15</sup> referred with favor to "l'arithmétique politique de M William Petty"<sup>16</sup> In Volume II of the *Encyclopédie*, in the Article *Célibat* published in 1751, but probably, in view of delays in publication,<sup>17</sup> prepared long before, Diderot wrote "S'il est vrai, ainsi qu'un Anglais l'a supputé, qu'un homme vaut à l'Etat plus de neuf livres sterling, . . ."<sup>18</sup> The reference is vague and the figure inaccurate, but the sentence can hardly refer to any one else than Petty Rousseau and Diderot at

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 512

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 642-43 An extract of the *Two Essays on London and Paris* appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions* for 1686, but without reference to Algerian Slaves Cf Hull, *op cit*, II, 643, 513 No 17th or 18th century editions of Petty's works in French are listed in the printed catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale

<sup>13</sup> *Jean Law, Considerations sur le numéraire*, in Eugene Daire, *op cit*, p 455 This passage has been kindly brought to my attention by Professor Emile Malakis of Johns Hopkins University

<sup>14</sup> *Confessions*, Hachette, VIII, 206

<sup>15</sup> After Rousseau's return from Geneva in 1754 *Ibid.*, 291

<sup>16</sup> Cited by Joseph Drouet, *L'abbé de Saint-Pierre*, Paris, 1912, p 281

<sup>17</sup> Difficulties with the censor, with collaborators, and particularly Diderot's imprisonment at Vincennes in 1749

<sup>18</sup> Vol II (1751), p 805, or Diderot, *Oeuvres*, Assézat ed, XIV (1876), p 56

this time were on most intimate terms. They talked over together in detail the subject and the style of the First Discourse<sup>19</sup>. It is very possible therefore that Diderot put his friend on the track of the second passage in Petty to which we have found no reference in the authors mentioned. In any case, the general allusion to methods of computing the "value"<sup>20</sup> of a man came to him no doubt from Melon, the picturesque and vigorous detail of the price of Algerian slaves may have been called to his attention by Diderot or some other friend, if not through his own reading of the particular *Essay in Political Arithmetick* dealing with London and Paris. Sir William Petty remained in both instances the original source.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

Ohio State University

#### UN TEXTE INÉDIT DE L'ABBÉ LEBLANC SUR LES LETTRES PHILOSOPHIQUES DE VOLTAIRE

Parmi les papiers rassemblés dans les portefeuilles du Président Bouhier à la section des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale, on trouve une lettre de l'abbé Leblanc, adressée au Président, qui contient plusieurs indications intéressantes sur la publication des *Lettres Philosophiques* de Voltaire. Cette lettre ne figure pas parmi les textes cités dans l'ouvrage d'Emmanuel de Broglie sur *Les Portefeuilles du Président Bouhier* (Paris, Hachette, 1896). Elle n'est pas signalée non plus par Gustave Lanson, dans sa remarquable édition critique des *Lettres Philosophiques*, parmi les textes exprimant les réactions des contemporains en face de cet ouvrage de Voltaire. Limitées à des sujets particuliers, les études les plus récentes consacrées à l'abbé Leblanc ne font pas mention de ce texte<sup>1</sup>. Il y a donc lieu, semble-t-il, de glisser une fiche addition-

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *Confessions*, Hachette, VIII, 249-250.

<sup>20</sup> Petty's figures of the "value" of a man are not always the same, ranging from L 69 to L 90 (Cf. *The Petty Papers*, edited by the Marquis of Lansdowne, 2 vols, London, 1927, I, 182, n). We have already seen, in addition, that Petty gave a still lower value in terms of the price of Algerian slaves, namely, L 60.

<sup>1</sup> G. R. Havens, "The Abbé Leblanc and English literature," *MP*, 1920-1921, 423-441, C. Looten, *La première controverse internationale sur*

nelle dans le dossier déjà volumineux des *Lettres Philosophiques*, en publiant ce commentaire inédit (Bibliothèque nationale, Mss fond français, 24 412, ff. 434, 435)

J'ai lu enfin les Lettres Philosophiques de Voltaire. C'est une édition autre que celle qui a été faite en Angleterre et que le Ministère a fait arrêter,<sup>2</sup> quand je dis autre, je veux dire que ce n'est pas la même, non que c'en soit une différente. Sur le peu de connoissance que j'ai de l'imprimerie et des différentes manières d'imprimer de Paris, de Londres, de Hollande, etc., ainsi que des différens caractères, je parierois tout ce que j'ai vaillant que celle-là est faite à Paris.<sup>3</sup> Je ne voudrois pas en être l'imprimeur et je ne sais comment lui, s'il est découvert, et Voltaire s'en tireront car M<sup>r</sup> le Garde des Sceaux l'a menacé très sérieusement de la Bastille si ces Lettres paroissent de façon quelconque.<sup>4</sup>

Pour vous dire présentement ce qu'il m'en semble, il y a 7 ou 8 lettres sur les Quakers d'Angleterre<sup>5</sup> qui n'en apprennent rien de nouveau mais qui sont, à quelque chose près, très plaisamment écrites. Le reste, j'en suis moins content, et en général je suis choqué d'un ton de mépris qui y règne partout et ce mépris porte également sur sa nation, sur notre gouvernement, sur nos ministres, surtout sur ce qu'il y a de plus respectable, en un mot sur la Religion. Il décide aussi cavalièrement de ces matières que du mérite ou des défauts de 4 vers anglais. Cela est d'une indécence horrible et j'ai bien peur que cela ne lui fasse des affaires. Les jansénistes surtout le vont beaucoup décrier, il tire sur eux dès qu'il en trouve l'occasion et il tire à boulets rouges. Il les attaque de front. M<sup>r</sup> Pascal, le géometre si renommé, cet homme de tant d'esprit et de savoir, l'auteur des Provinciales, en un mot l'un des Patriarches du parti, il le traite comme un misérable, comme un laquais. Ce sont ses Pensées sur la Religion qu'il attaque et cela d'un ton cavalier qu'on n'avoit peut-être encore jamais porté dans des matières si graves et avec un ton aussi méprisant que si il écrivoit contre l'auteur de la Gazette d'Amsterdam ou de Bruxelles. Et toujours attaquant la Religion en faisant semblant de la respecter. Et il y a outre cela une exposition de la philosophie de Descartes et de Newton et une appréciation de ce que l'un et l'autre peuvent avoir de mérites en géométrie. Voilà ce où je lis sans rien juger. Ceux qui le peuvent faire

---

*Shakespeare entre l'abbé Leblanc et W. Guthrie*, Mémoires des Facultés catholiques de Lille, 1927, fasc. 32, 189-236.

<sup>2</sup> L'édition de Thiériot. Lettres Ecrites sur les Anglois et Autres Sujets par M. D. V., A. Basle (Londres), in-8\*, 1734.

<sup>3</sup> En réalité à Rouen, par Jore, sous le titre Lettres Philosophiques par M. D. V., A. Amsterdam, Chez E. Lucas, au Livre D'Or, 1734, in-12.

<sup>4</sup> Les craintes de Voltaire à ce sujet s'expriment dans plusieurs de ses lettres en 1733 et 1734 (*Oeuvres*, ed. Moland, xxxiii, 357, 365, 369, 380, 405, 414).

<sup>5</sup> Il n'y a que quatre lettres sur les Quakers, mais les sept premières lettres sont consacrées aux sectes religieuses anglaises.

m'ont assure qu'il y a tout à parier qu'on lui a fourni les matériaux de ce morceau, <sup>6</sup> il m'a paru assez bien fait pour ce que j'y ai entendu Le livre coûte six francs et ne se vend que sous le manteau et avec peine Si cependant vous en souhaitez un exemplaire, je me charge de vous l'envoyer J'avoue qu'il est horriblement cher, car relié il n'aura guère que l'épaisseur d'un doigt et il se vend ainsi broché

G BONNO

*The University of California*

# A "FALSIFIED VERSE" IN KLEIST'S *HOMBURG*?

Ludwig Tieck writes, in June, 1846, to Georg Ernst Reimer, the son and successor of Kleist's publisher Georg Andreas Reimer in Berlin "Senden Sie mir doch Ein Exempl[ar] des Prinzen *Homburg*, in welchem ein Einziger Vers zu ändern ist, den der brave *Kleist* damals wegen der Franzosen verfälschen musste"<sup>1</sup> Tieck is preparing for publication his edition of Kleist's *Ausgewählte Schriften*<sup>2</sup> Reimer seems to have complied promptly with Tieck's request, sending him a copy either of the *Hinterlassene Schriften*<sup>3</sup> or of the *Gesammelte Schriften*<sup>4</sup>

A comparison of the print of 1846 with the *Erstdruck* of 1821 reveals the fact that the "verfälschter Vers" must be line 593<sup>5</sup> of *Homburg* In the first edition (p 39), and in all others known to me, this line reads

Gedrängt von Spaniens Tyrannenheeren,

<sup>6</sup> En effet, Voltaire, converti au newtonianisme par Maupertuis, lui fait corriger ses lettres sur Newton à la fin de 1732 (*Œuvres*, ed Moland, xxxiii, 312, 416)

<sup>1</sup> The letter has recently become accessible in *Letters of Ludwig Tieck* Hitherto unpublished 1792-1853 Collected and edited by E H Zeydel, P Matenko, and R H Fife New York (Modern Language Association), 1937, p 503

<sup>2</sup> *Heinrich von Kleists ausgewählte Schriften* Herausgegeben von Ludwig Tieck Berlin (Reimer), 1846-1847 4 vols

<sup>3</sup> *Heinrich von Kleists hinterlassene Schriften*, herausgegeben von L Tieck Berlin (Reimer), 1821

<sup>4</sup> *Heinrich von Kleist's gesammelte Schriften* Herausgegeben von Ludwig Tieck Berlin (Reimer), 1826 3 vols This has "Spaniens" (Vol II, p 249)

<sup>5</sup> 594 as usually numbered On the discrepancy, see *JEGP*, xxxv (1936), 502, footnote 12



whereas in Tieck's edition of 1846 (vol II, p 172) it runs

Gedrängt von den Tyrannenheeren Frankreichs

Now what is the probability that Tieck is right, and that "Frankreich," and not "Spanien," is what Kleist originally meant? One can only conjecture. Kleist's manuscript of *Homburg* is not preserved. There is only a scribe's copy, not revised by the poet, made for presentation to Princess William of Prussia. This copy, which is not accessible to me, must contain the accepted reading "Spanien," otherwise Erich Schmidt would have noted the deviation among the Variants in volume IV of his standard edition.<sup>6</sup> We cannot, then, produce any original reading or alteration in the poet's own hand. Nor do we know what manuscript Tieck used as "Druckvorlage," nor what became of it. Tieck himself tells us nothing of these important matters, and we have no "check" on him.

If Tieck did not see the alleged alteration in Kleist's own hand,<sup>7</sup> his knowledge of it could have come only from Kleist himself or from someone connected with Kleist. The first is improbable. Tieck's actual contact with Kleist was very slight. He met him (through their common friend, the painter Hartmann) in Dresden during the summer of 1808, in his *Vorrede* to the *Hinterlassene Schriften* of 1821 (p xxviii) he recalls this fact, and adds a brief description of Kleist's personal appearance. Though Tieck speaks, in a letter of September, 1816, to Hartmann, of "unser Freund Kleist,"<sup>8</sup> there is not the slightest record of a close association of Tieck and Kleist, nor of any exchange of letters.

Rather, it seems that Tieck's special interest in Kleist began with his undertaking, five years after Kleist's death, the editing of his posthumous works. The fact that he had little to contribute from his own contacts with Kleist is betrayed by the persistence with which he laid under contribution all the people he knew who had

<sup>6</sup> *Heinrich von Kleists Werke*. Im Verein mit Georg Minde-Pouet und Reinhold Steig herausgegeben von Erich Schmidt. Leipzig (Bibliog Inst), n. d. The new edition of this, edited by Minde-Pouet, still prints "Spanien", its last volume, containing the critical apparatus, has not yet appeared.

<sup>7</sup> The "suppression," of course, may have been purely mental, and not have showed in the MS, but have been reported orally.

<sup>8</sup> *Letters of Ludwig Tieck*, p 150.

also known Kleist Solger sounds out the Zenges, Hartmann, and Ruhle for him.<sup>9</sup> He gets valuable information from Wilhelm von Schutz, and "edits" it in his usual arbitrary manner, without mentioning his informant.<sup>10</sup> He draws on Pfuel and especially on Marie von Kleist, who was very close to the poet.<sup>11</sup>

From some such source, it seems to me, and not orally or in writing from Kleist himself, Tieck may have learned of the "falsification" of line 593. For if he had learned it from Kleist himself, that is before November, 1811, what possible ground could he have had for not incorporating the correction in his *Erstdruck* of 1821? The political considerations that prevailed when Kleist wrote were surely not valid six years after Waterloo, to say nothing of eleven years after, when Tieck published the *Gesammelte Schriften*! One may surmise, therefore, that Tieck learned of the matter from a surviving friend of Kleist's sometime between 1826 and 1846. At such remove from the poet himself, of course, there is a chance that somebody's memory may have played him false.

That Kleist originally wrote, or intended, "Frankreich" and not "Spanien" seems, however, not improbable. It was the time of his greatest patriotic fervor, and the necessity for disguising it had recently been demonstrated by his *Hermannsschlacht*. Moreover, the historical situation in the Netherlands at the time of the Battle of Fehrbellin (1675) calls for "France" and not "Spain" here. Spain and the Netherlands had been at peace since 1648. But France and the Netherlands had been at war since 1672, and in fact the Swedes who faced the Brandenburgers at Fehrbellin had been egged on by the French king.

Kleist, to be sure, is not noted for his fidelity to history, but this time, at least, historical fact would be on his side. And it would be strange if he had deliberately departed from history to traduce Spain, a "friendly nation" to him because an opponent of France at the time when he wrote. Historically, France, not Spain, was the enemy of the Lowlands in 1675, France, not Spain, was the enemy of Prussia in 1810, and Kleist himself had lately celebrated the Spaniard Palafox as the heroic foe of France (*An Palafox*).

If then, with the French still lords of Germany, he dared not

<sup>9</sup> *Heinrich von Kleists Werke*, ed. Er. Schmidt, iv, 283 f.

<sup>10</sup> See Vol. xvi of *Schriften der Kleist-Gesellschaft*.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*.

write "Frankreich," why did he write "Spanien?" Probably because in German literature the traditional oppressor of the Netherlands was Spain, and readers who remembered their *Egmont* and *Don Carlos* could be counted on not to question "Spaniens Tyrannenheere"

But if Tieck may in truth be credited with restoring one of Kleist's lines to its original form, his treatment of the rest of the text is decidedly not to his credit. Indeed, his general negligence casts doubt upon the authenticity of his "restoration" in line 593. He did not, unfortunately, limit his changes to that "Einziger Vers," and if this, his "Ausgabe letzter Hand" of Kleist's works, were our sole authority, we should have a very faulty version of Kleist's masterpiece. Whole lines, half-lines, stage-directions, scene-headings, single words are omitted, destroying sense and rhythm, some of Kleist's most characteristic constructions, such as "in Staub," or the simplex "bleicht" for "erbleicht," or his peculiar dative without preposition, are "ironed out"—and not even consistently at that. The gouty Kottwitz, dismounting, must gasp "Auf," forsooth (instead of "Ouf" or "Uff"), the unsparing realism of "duftend" (line 990) must fade into "lebloß." Of more extensive "Verschlimmbesserungen," the following may serve as an example, finding Kleist's lines 1623-1624 metrically imperfect

[dass Kurfurst Friedrich]

Des Prinzen Tat selbst—Nun, beim Himmel!

Das nenn' ich keck!

Tieck, with the skill of a Hans Sachs, amends to

Des angeklagten Prinzen Tat selbst hat—

Beim höchsten Gott! Das nenn' ich keck! Was! Die

[Veranlassung, etc.]

The loyal service which Tieck rendered Kleist's early reputation is beyond dispute, but that so painstaking an author should have found so negligent an editor must be accounted one of the many ironies of Kleist's career.

WALTER SILZ

*Swarthmore College*

GOETHE'S *AN DEN MOND*

Goethe's poem *An den Mond* has presented difficulties to commentators and editors. The reason that certain passages in the revised form of the poem published in 1789 seem to contain inconsistencies is that the poet himself is speaking in the version of 1778 and the assumption has been generally made that it is also he who is speaking in the later form of the poem. A careful study of the changes and additional stanzas leads the writer to the conclusion that Goethe has put the poem as revised into the mouth of a young lady of the court, Christine or Christel von Lasberg, who believing herself forsaken by her lover, drowned herself in the river Ilm not far from Goethe's *Gartenhaus*, January 17, 1778. The fact that she had in her pocket a copy of *Werthers Leiden* accentuated Goethe's grief and sympathy. Two days later he wrote to Frau von Stein, warning her against the spot where the girl had met her death: "Ich habe an Erinnerungen und Gedancken just genug und kan nicht wieder aus meinem Hause, Gute Nacht Engel, schonen Sie sich und gehn nicht heunter. Diese einladende Trauer hat was gefährlich anziehendes wie das Wasser selbst, und der Abglanz der Sterne des Himmels, der aus beyden leuchtet, lockt uns." Probably the first draft of the poem accompanied this letter, for Frau von Stein placed the two together in her files.

Füllest wieder 's liebe Tal  
 Still mit Nebelglanz,  
 Losest endlich auch einmal  
 Meine Seele ganz,

5     Breitest über mein Gefild  
 Landernd deinen Blick,  
 Wie der Liebsten Auge mild  
 über mein Geschick

Das du so beweglich kennst  
 10 Dieses Herz in Brand,  
 Haltet ihr wie ein Gespenst  
 An den Fluß gebannt,

Wenn in oder Winternacht  
 Er vom Tode schwillt  
 15 Und bei Frühlingslebens Pracht  
 An den Knospen quillt

- Seelig, wer sich vor der Welt  
 Ohne Haß verschleßt,  
 Einen Mann am Busen halt  
 20 Und mit dem genießt,  
 Was dem Menschen unbewußt  
 Odei wohl veracht,  
 Durch das Labyrinth der Brust  
 Wandelt in der Nacht

In this form it is a love poem addressed to Charlotte von Stein, but written under the weight of the tragic fate of Christine. The reference of 'der Liebsten Auge' v 7 and of 'du' v 9 is to Frau von Stein, while 'ihr' v 11 seems best interpreted as referring to her and 'den Mond'. It is not necessary to assume that the last two stanzas are spoken by a woman. The poet presents a contrast of the fate of the unhappy girl to that of the more fortunate woman (Frau von Stein), who can withdraw from the world with her lover and enjoy that ideal love which is either unknown to most human beings or despised by them. The version of 1789 follows

- Fullest wieder Busch und Tal  
 Still mit Nebelglanz,  
 Losest endlich auch einmal  
 Meine Seele ganz,  
 5 Breitest über mein Gefild  
 Lindernd deinen Blick,  
 Wie des Freundes Auge mild  
 Über mein Geschick  
 Jeden Nachklang fühlt mein Herz  
 10 Froh- und trüber Zeit,  
 Wandle zwischen Freud' und Schmerz  
 In der Einsamkeit  
 Fließe, fließe, lieber Fluß!  
 Nimmer werd' ich froh  
 15 So verrauschte Scherz und Kuß,  
 Und die Treue so  
 Ich besaß es doch einmal,  
 Was so kostlich ist!  
 Daß man doch zu seiner Qual  
 20 Nimmer es vergißt!  
 Rausche, Fluß, das Tal entlang,  
 Ohne Rast und Ruh,  
 Rausche, flustre meinem Sang  
 Melodien zu!

- 25 Wenn du in der Winternacht  
 Wutend überschwillst,  
 Oder um die Frühlingspracht  
 Junger Knospen quillst
- Selig, wei sich vor der Welt
- 30 Ohne Haß veerschließt,  
 Einen Freund am Busen halt  
 Und mit dem genießt,
- Was, von Menschen nicht gewußt,  
 Oder nicht bedacht,
- 35 Durch das Labyrinth der Brust  
 Wandelt in der Nacht

This later form of the poem has called forth widely divergent opinions ranging from unrestrained and extravagant praise of the melody and the beauty of its symbolism<sup>1</sup> to such adverse views as that "whatever of unity it possesses must be read into it"<sup>2</sup> and that "the last four stanzas do such injury to the artistic quality and general significance of the poem that they ought to be omitted"<sup>3</sup>. All commentators agree that it is the poet himself who is speaking in the original poem of 1778 and they likewise assume that this is the case of the revision of 1789. They have failed to recognize the possibility that Goethe in the later version is permitting the unfortunate Christel von Lasberg in the first person to lament her fate by the stream in the misty moonlight. Goethe would scarcely have changed 'der Liebsten' in verse 7 to 'des Freundes' except for some significant reason, the most natural explanation is that in the final form of the poem a woman is speaking of 'des Freundes Auge'. 'Freund' often translates in German 'beloved,' as in the *Song of Songs* of the Old Testament and elsewhere. Ermatinger apparently had some misgivings about 'Freund' in verse 31, but insists that we must not be misled into putting that stanza into the mouth of Frau von Stein, stating that this possibility is excluded by 'Sang' verse 23, which he claims must refer to Goethe's lyrics. There is however no reason why the murmuring stream should not furnish melodies to the plants of Christel von Lasberg. Baumgart concedes that the fourth stanza

<sup>1</sup> Baumgart, *Goethes lyrische Dichtung in ihrer Entwicklung und Bedeutung*, I, 205 ff., Ermatinger, *Die deutsche Lyrik*, I, 149 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Selections from Goethe's Poems* by Charles Harris

<sup>3</sup> *Goethe's Poems* by Martin Schutze

may refer to the young woman but shrinks from drawing the obvious conclusion

There is certainly an abrupt transition from the complete tranquility and peace of soul of the first two stanzas and the mood of the fourth, fifth and sixth, but one needs only to recall numerous inconsistencies in *Faust*, where Goethe retained lines and scenes that did not fit in with the chronology or the whole plan of the work. In this poem the first two stanzas were too fine to be discarded, they expressed a mood so beautifully that he was willing to take a chance with the difficulty of the transition to the depressed attitude of the girl moving 'zwischen Freud' und Schmerz in der Einsamkeit,' the girl, who would never again be happy, who can never forget "Was so kostlich ist," even though the memories mean torment. The stream furnishes melodies to her plaintive song, in the winter floods and amid the blossoms of spring. Enviously she contemplates the woman, who, happy in the embrace of the beloved one, can without hatred withdraw from the world and give herself up to the mysteries of her own breast.

The day after the death of the young woman Goethe worked with laborers till late at night to erect some sort of an 'Andencken' to her.<sup>4</sup> His first plan did not satisfy him, for it was by the road, "wo man weder hintreten und beten, noch lieben soll." With a helper he excavated a portion of a cliff, from which "in hochster Abgeschiedenheit" one could view the paths along which she had last walked and the spot of her death. Probably before his Italian journey, in 1786, he seems to have erected for Christel in this poem a more enduring memorial, which "in hochster Abgeschiedenheit" has not been recognized by passers-by.

CLARENCE WILLIS EASTMAN

Amherst College

### DER DRUCKER DES HESSISCHEN LANDBOTEN

In Karl Vietor's 1939 bei Haupt in Bern erschienener Monographie *Georg Buchner als Politiker*, die zum ersten Mal die Entwicklung der politischen Überzeugung und Wirksamkeit des Dichters zusammenfassend darstellt, wird natürlich auch die wich-

<sup>4</sup> Letter to Frau von Stein, *Weimar edition*, iv, 3, p. 207

tige, von Buchner verfasste sozialrevolutionäre Flugschrift *Der Hessische Landbote* von 1834 eingehend behandelt (S 80 ff.) Dabei wird an drei Stellen (S 88, 95, 101) erwähnt, dass dieser aufreizende Aufruf von dem "Buchhändler Karl Preller in Offenbach" im Geheimen gedruckt wurde, ohne dass jedoch näher auf die sonstige, dem Verfasser wohl unbekannte Druckertätigkeit dieses Mannes eingegangen wird. Die Tatsache selbst, dass Preller der Drucker der ausserordentlich radikalen Schrift war, steht aktenmässig fest. Sie ist in dem Gerichtsprotokoll der Aussagen des Verräters der Buchner'schen Verschwörergruppe, des Studenten Gustav Clemm, in den von Vietor (S 100 f., 131) erstmalig benutzten Akten des Hessischen Staatsarchivs enthalten.

Zum besseren Verständnis anderer Zusammenhänge hatte es sich ohne Zweifel gelohnt, der bisher noch nicht aufgeworfenen Frage einmal nachzugehen, wer denn dieser Drucker des *Landboten* eigentlich war, zumal sich ausserdem die zweite Frage aufdrängt, warum die Geheimbundler in Giessen gerade diese Offenbacher Druckerei wählten. Aus der einzigen, freilich an recht versteckter Stelle stehenden Arbeit, die sich genauer mit Offenbacher Druckern dieser Periode beschäftigt hat,<sup>1</sup> kann man nun zwei für uns hier wesentliche Tatsachen über den Drucker erfahren. Erstens berichtet sie (S 15), dass der Buchhändler und Drucker Karl Preller überhaupt nur sehr kurze Zeit, nämlich drei Jahre von April 1832 bis zum März 1835 in seinem Gewerbe tätig war, nachdem er die angesehene, in der Drucker- und Buchhandelsgeschichte der Zeit nicht unbedeutende Firma von Carl Ludwig Brede in Offenbach am Main käuflich erworben hatte. Weiter wird (S. 16) mitgeteilt, dass es in der Hauptsache wohl Geldschwierigkeiten gewesen seien, die Preller zu einem so baldigen Bankrott getrieben, und sogar zur Versteigerung seines Druckinventars geführt hatten. Jetzt, wo wir wissen, dass er der Drucker des *Landboten* war, ist die wahre Ursache dieses raschen geschäftlichen Zusammenbruchs ohne weiteres klar. es war das Eingreifen der Darmstadter Regierung, die im Frühjahr 1835 durch die gerichtliche Untersuchung gegen die Verbreiter der 2. Ausgabe des *Landboten*, seine Teilnahme an der Veröffentlichung der 1. Ausgabe der höchst staatsgefährlichen Flugschrift erfahren hatte (Vietor a a O., S. 101).

<sup>1</sup> Adolf Volker, "Ulrich Weiss, Carl Ludwig Brede u. d. Bredesche Druckerei," In: *Alt-Offenbach*, Bll. d. Offenb. Gesch. Ver. 6 Jhg. (1930), S 1 ff.



Viel bemerkenswerter jedoch ist vielleicht, dass Preller mit der Herstellung von solchen Geheimschriften im gewissen Sinn nur eine Tradition seines geachteten Vorgangers fortsetzte. Als der Schwiegersohn eines bekannten Druckers, des Ulrich Weiss, war Carl Ludwig Brede schon seit 1783 als Verleger und Teilhaber der Firma Weiss & Brede gleichfalls im deutschen Buchhandel wohlbekannt<sup>2</sup>. Nach einer 35jährigen Tätigkeit als selbständiger Drucker und Verleger hatte er sich schliesslich 1832 ins Privatleben zurückgezogen (Volker, a. a. O., S. 6ff.). Schon wenige Monate nach dem Verkauf seines Geschäftes schien Brede "den allergrossten Wert darauf zu legen, in der Öffentlichkeit nicht mehr als Inhaber der lange, lange Jahre von ihm geführten Druckerei zu gelten". Wiederholt glaubte er, 1833 und 1835 in öffentlichen Anzeigen auf diese Tatsache aufmerksam machen zu müssen (Volker a. a. O., S. 15), offenbar weil er fürchtete, für Drucke seines Nachfolgers Preller, der den Namen der alten Firma beibehalten hatte, verantwortlich gemacht zu werden. Was dies in bestimmten Fällen bedeuten konnte, wusste Brede aus seiner eigenen Praxis nur zu gut. Hatte er doch im Anfang des Jahres 1822 für den bekannten Frankfurter Verleger Wilmans nichts Geringeres als den *Meister Floh* von E. T. A. Hoffmann, jene scharfe, wenn auch etwas persönliche, politische Satire gegen die Demagogenriechelei in seiner Offizin hergestellt. Um sie hatte sich ein heftiger Zensurkampf entsponnen, bis sie mit Verkürzungen freigegeben wurde<sup>3</sup>. Der Verleger Wilmans war mit Brede vor allem als mit dem Drucker einer Reihe schon ausgestatteter *Taschenbücher der Liebe und Freundschaft* bekannt, die zum Teil von Wilmans, zum Teil von einem Leipziger Buchhändler verlegt wurden (Volker a. a. O., S. 9f.). In der Wilmans'schen Serie waren schon 1819 und 1820 Erzählungen von Hoffmann als Erstdrucke veröffentlicht worden. Gewiss wird Brede im Laufe seiner langjährigen Druckertätigkeit noch andere, ähnlich heikle Aufgaben wie die Herstellung des *Meister Floh* übernommen haben. Von einer weiteren wissen wir bestimmt, dem Druck der aus dem Beginn der zwanziger Jahre stammenden Schrift *Das Testament des Deutschen Volksboten, ein Buch für Bürger, Bauern und andere, die es lesen wollen* (Volker a. a. O., S. 14f.). Sie ge-

<sup>2</sup> Joh. Goldfriedrich, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Buchhandels*, Bd. 3 (1909), S. 502.

<sup>3</sup> Vgl. E. T. A. Hoffmann, *persönl. u. briefl. Verkehr ges. u. erkl.* v. Hans v. Müller, Bd. 2, H. 2 (Berlin 1912), Br. 464 ff. u. Anm. z. Br. 245.

hort zu den von Vietor in seinem Buchnerbuch (S. 84ff.) näher behandelten politischen Flugschriften des Vormarz

Nun ist wohl die Vermutung nicht abwegig, dass Buchner aus der Kenntnis des *Meister Floh* und seines auf der Rückseite des Titelblattes ausdrücklich genannten Druckers ("Druck und Papier von C L Brede in Offenbach") den Geschäftsnachfolger Preller für vertrauenswürdig genug hielt, um ihn mit dem Druck seines *Landboten* zu beauftragen. Vielleicht wusste er auch nicht einmal, dass die alte Firma ihren Besitzer gewechselt hatte. Dass er Hoffmanns Werke kannte, ist schon durch seinen Brief an die Braut vom März 1834 erwiesen,<sup>4</sup> und die Linie von Hoffmann zu Buchner ist darüber hinaus sicherlich von besonderer Bedeutung (Bergemann a a O, S 492)

Nachdem die hessische Polizei Ende Juli—Anfang August 1834 durch Verrat einige der Verbreiter des *Landboten* entdeckt hatte, war Buchner, dem man zunächst nichts nachweisen konnte, sofort nach Offenbach geeilt, um Preller, dem er Anfang Juni das Manuskript der Schrift persönlich überbracht hatte, zu warnen. Wie erwähnt, brach Prellers Betrieb im März 1835 zusammen, weil, wie jetzt als gesichert angesehen werden kann, um diese Zeit die gerichtliche Untersuchung, über die ein Protokoll von Mitte April vorliegt, seinen Namen als den des Druckers der ersten Ausgabe der Flugschrift ermittelt hatte. In einem Brief an die Familie aus Strassburg vom Anfang August 1835 (Bergemann a a O, S 386) berichtete dann Buchner, dass Flüchtlinge "die Nachricht von neuen Verhaftungen dreier Familienväter . . . , der dritte in Offenbach" gebracht hatten. Ohne Zweifel war dieser Dritte der Offenbacher Buchhändler und Drucker Karl Preller.

HEINRICH SCHNEIDER

*Cornell University*

---

<sup>4</sup> *Georg Buchners Werke u. Briefe* Hrsg v Fritz Bergemann, Leipzig o J (1926), S 365

FLAUBERT'S *UNE NUIT DE DON JUAN*

Among Flaubert's posthumous papers is the *ébauche*<sup>1</sup> of a *nouvelle*<sup>2</sup> which he intended to call *Une Nuit de Don Juan*. Its date falls within the period of the great romantic revival of the Don Juan theme in the first half of the nineteenth century

Flaubert's first indication of interest in Don Juan occurs in *La Peste à Florence* (1836), at the head of which he quotes a line from Dumas père's *Don Juan de Marana* "C'est que je te hais d'une haine de frère"<sup>3</sup> It occurs next in a novelette, *Passion et vertu* (1837), in which he describes the protagonist as a Don Juan<sup>4</sup> The third reference to Don Juan is in his *Notes de voyages* for April-May, 1845 In the church of Saint Trophime at Arles he remarks

<sup>1</sup> Maupassant, *Lettres de Gustave Flaubert à George Sand* (Charpentier, 1884), includes the plan in his preface, it may also be found, with two extra pages (omitted by M) giving the intended development of the action, in Flaubert, *Œuvres de jeunesse inédites*, V III (Conard, 1910) No studies on the work exist Mention may be found in Maupassant, *op cit*, P Shanks, *Flaubert's Youth* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, 1927), E W Fischer, *Études sur Flaubert inédit* (Leipzig, Zeitler, 1908), G de Bévotte, *La Légende de Don Juan*, V II (Hachette, 1911), and Canu, "L'Œuvre dramatique de Flaubert," in *R H L F*, V XXXVIII (1931)

<sup>2</sup> It is possible but not probable that the work was to be a play Maupassant, *op cit*, p xlv, calls it a *nouvelle*, Bévotte, *op cit*, p 66, a *conte* and a *nouvelle*, Shanks, *op cit*, p 218, ambiguously refers to it as an "undated scenario"; the Conard Flaubert, *Œuv de jeun*, III, 319, calls it the "plan d'un conte", Canu, *loc cit*, p 542, observes that "C'était sous forme de dialogue qu'il [Flaubert] comptait analyser la mystique du sentiment amoureux" He does not call it a play, however Canu's reference to Flaubert is from the *Correspondance*, II, 253 (Conard, 1926-1933) Flaubert here speaks of doing a play on a political situation [*Le Candidat*], then goes on to say that he has three other subjects in mind, all rather alike, one of which he definitely calls a *roman* He refers to the Don Juan as an *histoire* (*ibid*, pp 253-254), not as a play The *ébauche* itself somewhat resembles the scenario of a play, especially in the detailed directions as to plot, action, and suggested conversation But Flaubert was accustomed to make similar detailed scenarios for his novels and *contes* A study of the summary shows some details not very feasible for the stage

<sup>3</sup> Act IV, Tableau VII, Sc IV Flaubert perhaps remembered the tag from seeing the play on the stage It was first performed April 30, 1836, and probably not printed until after Flaubert's work was finished in September

<sup>4</sup> *Œuv. de jeun*, I, 242-243

C'est dans une église pareille et dans une telle atmosphère que Don Juan arrive et se tient caché derrière les colonnes, à regarder les couds penchés, les profils purs inclinés sur le prie Dieu, respirant la femme et l'encens,<sup>5</sup>

a statement which Piaget Shanks considers the probable embryo of the unfinished *Nuit de Don Juan*. As he notes, the idea returns to Flaubert while in a church in Genoa.<sup>6</sup>

If, as Shanks contends, this represents the germ of the *nouvelle*, it is not until five years later that Flaubert says that the idea of a Don Juan story came to him in the hospital at Rhodes "A propos de sujets, j'en ai trois, qui ne sont peut-être que le même et ça m'embête considérablement, 1° *Une Nuit de Don Juan*, à laquelle j'ai pensé au lazaret de Rhodes"<sup>7</sup> Flaubert never again alludes to the conception of the story, either in his correspondence or in his *Notes de voyages*. But Rhodes is in a country of temples and churches, and he had just come from Palestine, so a religious story (which he admits it is to be in the next quotation below) would likely be in his mind. Furthermore, the oriental setting of Musset's *Namouna*, a Don Juan poem which we know Flaubert read about this time, or Byron's *Don Juan* (specifically the harem episode in cantos IV-VII) may have inspired Flaubert while in a country redolent with the atmosphere of the East. We may tentatively postulate the following sequence. When traveling in the Near East, Flaubert thinks of oriental religious stories, such as the oriental *Namouna*, or Dumas' play or Mérimée's *nouvelle* with their religious tone. The Don Juan theme develops in his mind, the oriental setting fades, and the plot finally materializes with the more conventional European setting.

Flaubert soon wearies of his Don Juan, it comes to seem "bien commun et bien rabâché," and it is but "l'éternelle histoire de la

<sup>5</sup> *Notes de voyages*, I, 10-11 (Conard, 1910)

<sup>6</sup> Shanks, *op cit*, pp 218-219. The quotation is from Flaubert's *Corr*, I, 169-170. He probably has in mind either Dumas' play or Mérimée's *nouvelle*, *Les Ames du purgatoire*. Flaubert never refers anywhere to the latter, but there is quite a strong similarity in one scene where Don Juan enters a church, sees the nuns kneeling and praying, and, in order to hide, "s'adossa contre un pilier" and watches the nun Teresa enter the confessional. Dumas (Act IV, Tableau VI, Sc I) depicts more or less the same general scene, without the details (which, however, Flaubert might have observed in the *mise en scène*, if, as was suggested in note 3, he saw the play on the stage).

<sup>7</sup> *Corr*, II, 253-254

religieuse" Then it apparently returned to his favor, for he writes that it "avance piano"<sup>8</sup> This is his last mention of the work

Strangely enough, thirty years later, it was projected for a new rôle Apropos of *Bouvard et Pécuchet* Maupassant tells that Flaubert intended to write a second volume consisting of platitudes gathered in good faith by the two ex-copyists as pearls of wisdom To relieve the heaviness of such a compendium, Flaubert proposed to intercalate two or three stories of a poetic idealism, also copied by Bouvard and Pécuchet One was to be the *Nunt de Don Juan*<sup>9</sup> Conceived in his romantic youth as a serious study, it would have become a satire on romantic idealism But Flaubert died before he could put his early *nouvelle* to its new use

The sources are fairly easy to ascertain For general background, the following are pretty sure Beside the Dumas version already referred to, Flaubert mentions Mozart's opera, Gautier's *Don Juan* (i e, in his *Comédie de la mort*), and Musset's *Namouna*<sup>10</sup> Molière's *Festin de pierre* would be known to any author of Flaubert's day, and Byron's poem and Mérimée's *nouvelle* are likely inclusions

The title of Flaubert's *ébauche* is a possible reminiscence of Musset's unfinished *Matinée de Don Juan*,<sup>11</sup> and Musset's valet is named Leporello as with Flaubert However, both versions probably take the name from Mozart In fact, the whole of the first part of the plan strongly suggests Mozart's opera To be sure, the general tone of the *nouvelle* is romantic and tells us little definite as to sources, but behind it lies the skeleton of a plot in which a servant named Leporello upbraids his master for his profligacy and inconstancy This is a prominent motif in Act One of Mozart's opera. Although other versions, notably Molière's and Tirso de Molina's, have a servant in the rôle of moral castigator, Mozart's stresses this side most strongly Molière's Sganarelle remonstrates with his master, but emphasizes his libertinage and blasphemy

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 295 and 304, resp

<sup>9</sup> *Op cit.*, p xlv E W Fischer, *op cit.*, pp 9-10, and Bévotte, *op cit.*, p 66, tell the same story Flaubert never mentions it, the source of both men is seemingly Maupassant

<sup>10</sup> *Corr.*, I, 352, and III, 30, resp Other versions popular in Flaubert's day were Blaze de Bury's *Le Souper chez le commandeur*, Balzac's *L'Élixir de longue vie*, and the Spanish *El Estudiante de Salamanca* by Espronceda and *Don Juan Tenorio* by Zorrilla

<sup>11</sup> This appeared in *La France littéraire*, Dec 1833.

Flaubert is not likely to have had direct acquaintance with the Tirso play<sup>12</sup>

Don Juan's killing of Doña Elvire's brother and subsequent flight hint at several sources. The name Elvire brings to mind Mozart's Elvira or Molière's Elvire, but in the opera there is no avenging brother, and in the play, while there are two brothers pursuing Don Juan, neither is killed. In Mérimée's *nouvelle*, however, Teresa's brother Don Pedro provokes Don Juan to a duel and is killed. Flaubert apparently combined two sources. In Dumas' play, it is Don Juan's own brother who is killed.

Leporello's accusation against his master, and the latter's admission, that he loves ugly old women are already found in Gautier's *Comédie de la mort*.

The second part points more definitely to Dumas. The dying nun, the plot to abduct her from the convent, and her death are all in his play, although Flaubert omitted the episode in which Marthe wanders over the countryside sick and half crazed with grief, as well as the supernatural element so strong in Dumas. The actual name Thérèse, in Flaubert's work, suggests Mérimée's Teresa. The reference to the Commander's statue and to Don Juan's descent to hell indicates the traditional version of the Don Juan Tenorio branch of the legend, and Mozart or Molière is the likely provenance.<sup>13</sup>

Flaubert's conception of the Don Juan character, with its *ennui* and its inability to attain the ideal to which it aspires, is typically romantic, stemming directly from Mérimée and Musset and the whole 1830 school. The first part of the plan contains little originality unless it be a few details such as the wooden figurehead in the garden or Don Juan's desire to return to a state of youthful innocence. Flaubert's claim to originality would lie in his transformation of the woman who saves—in the works of Blaze de Bury, Dumas, and Zorrilla but a lifeless emissary from heaven—into a

<sup>12</sup> Unlike many French writers of his day, Flaubert had little interest in Spain or its literature. Throughout all his correspondence, there are only a few references to *Don Quixote*, a scant remark on Calderón and Lope de Vega, and some youthful observations on Andalusia (*Corr.*, I, 15, 29, 76, 78, 117, II, 50, III, 31, 53, 323, VI, 13).

<sup>13</sup> With Zorrilla, Dumas, Mérimée, and Blaze de Bury (despite the title *Le Souper chez le commandeur*), Don Juan is saved. In Baudelaire's *Don Juan aux enfers* (published May, 1846), which Flaubert may have read, there is no reference to the descent to hell.

character powerful as Don Juan himself<sup>14</sup> Flaubert would have depicted a sensuous, repressed nun, finding in religious asceticism a voluptuous, but unsatisfying, pleasure corresponding to what Don Juan receives from his unrestrained love Together they would have experienced the perfect communion of love that apart they could not achieve Thus would be consummated the romantic's eternal desire<sup>15</sup>

ARMAND E. SINGER

*Duke University*

---

### TRANSLATIONS OF ZOLA IN THE UNITED STATES PRIOR TO 1900

One of the most striking and interesting features of the cultural life of the United States during the last three decades of the nineteenth century is the great interest shown by American readers in contemporary French literature, usually in translation It seems probable that any attempt to evaluate or explain the trend of our own literature since the turn of the century must take into account this interest Translations from the French were more numerous by far than those from any other modern language Surprisingly numerous, indeed, for a careful study of only four<sup>1</sup> out of many American periodicals of the period reveals, in reviews or articles or brief notices, that over two hundred and twenty-five different French authors were introduced to the American reader in English translation, and that over three hundred and fifty different French authors were deemed important enough to be the subject of one or more reviews or articles

Of all of these authors, however, if we judge, as we must, by numbers of editions, Emile Zola was the most popular Between 1878, the date of the first<sup>2</sup> American translation of any work of Zola, and 1900 thirty-one American publishers brought out, counting duplications and new editions when it is possible to ascertain

<sup>14</sup> Bévotte, *op cit*, p 67

<sup>15</sup> Flaubert himself suggests this, *Œuv de jeun*, III, 325

<sup>1</sup> *The Nation*, *The North American Review*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, *Harpers Magazine*

<sup>2</sup> *Hélène* T B Peterson Brothers Philadelphia, 1878

these, something like one hundred and eighty books of this author. The figures are impressive. For twenty-one years every eight months some new publisher entered the market with one or more books from the pen of Zola, and eight times a year, during this period, a new American translation of Zola was put on sale. It is not possible, at this date, to ascertain just how many copies of these translations were sold, but the number must have been large. The catalogue of Peterson Brothers, of Philadelphia, publishers of the greatest number of Zola titles, calls their sale "unprecedented." For the most part they were published in cheap paper-covered form, priced to sell at anywhere from twenty cents to a dollar, and were obviously designed for "popular" consumption. Indeed, the terms in which they were often advertised throws not a little light on the nature of the interest that American readers had in them. The title page of *Claude's Confession*, published by Crawford of Philadelphia in 1892, bears a brief summary of the story, reading in part as follows:

*Claude's Confession* by Emile Zola is one of the most exciting and naturalistic romances that great author has ever produced. The book is a deep and searching analysis of human feelings, and surely the miseries of student life in the Paris 'Quartier Latin' were never set forth in such vivid and startling fashion as in its pages. Claude, Laurence, Marie, Jacques, and Pâquerette play parts in a dark drama of blasted youth and dissipation truly Parisian in all its characteristics, and the interest excited in these personages and their eventful careers is simply overwhelming. The description of the public ball is a bit of lurid word painting which Zola has never surpassed. Marie's death and the denouement are depicted in a style that is powerful in the highest degree. *Claude's Confession* is one of the strongest books imaginable, and will certainly fascinate all who take it up.

And this language could be matched by many another quotation.

In the following enumeration, the figure accompanying the titles indicates the number of translations issued by different publishers, not the total number of translations taking into account reprints or new editions. The novels in the *Rougon-Macquart* series were translated as follows: *La Fortune des Rougon*, *Une Page d'Amour*, and *L'Assommoir*, eight each; *Nana* and *Pot-Bouille*, six each; *La Conquête de Plassans*, *La Faute de l'Abbé Mouret*, *La Curée*, *Le Rêve*, *La Jone de Vivre*, *Germinal*, and *L'Argent*, five each; *Au Bonheur des Dames* and *La Terre*, four each; *L'Oeuvre* and *Le Docteur Pascal*, three each; and *La Bête Humaine* and *La*



*Débâcle*, two each Also *La Fille de Nana*, by Alfred Sirven and Henri LeVerdier was published twice as *Nana's Daughter*, and each time credited to Zola by the publishers' advertisements

While the series of *Les Quatre Evangiles* was not translated before 1900, the titles in *Les Trois Villes* did appear, *Lourdes*, three times, *Rome* and *Paris*, one each Other novels of Zola were translated as follows *Thérèse Raquin*, six times, *Madeleine Ferat*, five, and *Les Mystères de Marseilles* and *La Confession de Claude*, four each With one exception, the short stories of Zola were not translated in the collections he made of them. Instead, American publishers chose from one collection or more as they pleased and published their selection under such titles as they thought would best attract the buyer The result was the appearance of *Her Two Husbands* and *Jacques Damour*, each published twice, and *The Jolly Parisiennes* and *Stories for Ninon*, each published once. The most popular of his *contes* was *The Attack on the Mill* which, usually in company with other stories, was published by five different publishers in all To conclude this list, there remain the following titles, each published once *Modern Marriage*, *The Experimental Novel*, *The Dreyfus Case*, *Four Letters to France*, and *The Trial of Emile Zola* This latter was, of course, concerned with Zola and his part in the *affaire*

No surer proof of an author's popularity can be found than in the appearance of volumes bearing his name, yet his in name only. This happened at least twice in the case of Zola One bore the title *Emile Zola's First Love Story*<sup>3</sup> It is a highly imaginative account of a youthful romance of Zola, translated from an unknown source by Max Maury The other was *The Two Duchesses*<sup>4</sup> This is an extremely interesting novel, based upon a *cause célèbre* in Parisian high life of 1882, the suit brought by the young duchesse de Chaulnes against her mother-in-law, the duchesse de Chevreuse, for the custody of the former's children Yet interesting as it is, it is most certainly not by Zola, but probably by some hack of republican prejudices, and is mostly concocted from the printed reports of the trial But it was sold to American readers as by Zola

Perhaps the most interesting thing about the translations which

<sup>3</sup> Jewett and Buchanan, Chicago, 1895

<sup>4</sup> In F. Tousey's *Brookside Library*, New York, 1884 The present writer is engaged in a further study of this book

were published in this country is the way in which the titles of the French books were changed, often in such a way as to be practically unrecognizable. The reason for such a change is not far to seek, and has already been suggested in the quotation of the advertising that accompanied *Claude's Confession* and in the titles of some of the short-story collections. The roots of the commonplace American idea that French literature is fundamentally wicked lie deep, and it is not within the scope of this paper to examine them, but it did exist and the American publishers exploited it to the utmost.

Thus, *La Fortune des Rougon* appeared in English as, *The Rougon-Macquart Family*,<sup>5</sup> *The Girl in Scarlet*,<sup>6</sup> and *Wedded in Death*.<sup>7</sup> *Une Page d'Amour* became *Hélène A Love Episode*,<sup>8</sup> and *A Woman's Heart, or, A Stray Leaf from the Book of Love*.<sup>9</sup> *Son Excellence, Eugène Rougon*, became *Clorinda*,<sup>10</sup> *The Mysteries of the Court of Louis Napoleon*,<sup>11</sup> and *Star of Empire*.<sup>12</sup> *La Conquête de Plassans*, likewise, had at least three English titles, to wit *A Mad Love, or, The Abbé and His Court*,<sup>13</sup> *A Fatal Conquest, or, Buried in the Ashes of a Ruined Home*,<sup>14</sup> and *The Conquest of Plassans, or, The Priest in the House*. Our publishers found it impossible, and perhaps unbusinesslike, to translate *L'Oeuvre* simply, and so it appeared in two different forms, *Christine the Model, or, Studies of Love*<sup>15</sup> and *His Masterpiece*,<sup>17</sup> while such comparatively simple titles as *Madeleine Ferat* and *Thérèse Raquin* appeared as *Driven to Her Doom, or, The Finger of Fate*,<sup>18</sup> and *Nemesis, or, Haunted by the Specter of a Murdered Man*,<sup>19</sup> respectively, besides being translated with the simple title one would expect.

From 1900 up to the present, while a good many publishers have continued to issue translations of Zola, not nearly so many titles have appeared. The passage of the International Copyright Law

<sup>5</sup> Peterson, Philadelphia, 1879

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid*, 1882

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, 1882

<sup>12</sup> F. Tousey, New York, 1884

<sup>7</sup> F. Tousey, New York, 1884

<sup>13</sup> Peterson, Philadelphia, 1882

<sup>8</sup> Peterson, Philadelphia, 1878

<sup>14</sup> F. Tousey, New York, 1883

<sup>9</sup> F. Tousey, New York, in or before 1884

<sup>15</sup> Land and Lee, Chicago, 1891

<sup>10</sup> Peterson, Philadelphia, 1880

<sup>16</sup> Peterson, Philadelphia, 1886

<sup>17</sup> Stein Publishing Co., Chicago, 1899

<sup>18</sup> F. Tousey, New York, in or before 1884

<sup>19</sup> F. Tousey, New York, 1883. In 1892, R. K. Fox of New York published *Thérèse Raquin* as *The Devil's Compact*

probably has some bearing on this. Perhaps, too, American readers became sated with Zola's often sordid realism. Whatever the reason may be, for a period of almost twenty-five years Zola did have a popularity in this country that even few native authors of the time enjoyed.

MALCOLM B. JONES

*Connecticut College for Women*

### A NOTE ON LEOPARDI'S "BRUTO MINORE"

Leopardi's debt to Ugo Foscolo was indicated rather casually by Arturo Graf in his *Foscolo, Manzoni, Leopardi*, published in Turin in 1898. Two years later G. Marpillero,<sup>1</sup> following this lead, discovered that practically all the ideas in Leopardi's *Bruto Minore* had already been expressed by Foscolo in his *Ultime Lettere di Jacopo Ortis*. Not only is this true, but the order in which the ideas are presented is almost identical. In noting this I am but adding a paragraph to Marpillero's excellent article.

The letters<sup>2</sup> which seem to form the substance of *Bruto Minore* are those dated "Ventimiglia, 19 e 20 febbrajo" (pp. 122-126), "Rimino, 5 marzo (ore undici della sera)" (p. 127, "14 marzo" (pp. 130-134), "mezzanotte" (pp. 134-138), "25 marzo, 1799, venerdì, ore 1" (pp. 146-151).

Both heroes are in a solitary spot. Ortis in the Alps (p. 122) and Brutus cursing the gods and Hell "per l'atra notte in erma sede" (I. 11). Ortis, gazing upon the mountain barriers ineffectual against the invading nations, invokes the great dead while the enemies of Italy "*calpestano* <sup>3</sup> i loro sepolcri," and soliloquizes on the fate of Rome, the prey "de' Cesari . . . de' Vandali, e de' Papi" (p. 124). Leopardi in the opening lines of his poem, laments the Fate which is preparing for Italian valleys and the

<sup>1</sup> "Werther, Ortis e il Leopardi," *Giornale storico* (Vol. 36, 1900) pp. 357 ff. See also G. Natali, *Cultura e poesia in Italia nell'età napoleonica*, Sten, 1930, pp. 179-196.

<sup>2</sup> The edition cited is that of Lemonnier, Florence, containing "le considerazioni morali scritte nel 1817 da Giovanni Scalvini."

<sup>3</sup> All Italics are mine.

Tiber's shore "*Il calpestio de' barbari cavalli*" and is calling "gotici brandi" to destroy the walls of Rome

In the following paragraph Ortis decries both *virtù*, the cloak of injustice, and the gods who arm themselves with the arms of the conquerors and befriend the mighty Leopardi in his second stanza has Brutus inveigh against "*Stolta virtù*" and the "*marmorei dei*," for whom men are a jest and whose law teaching the reward of the righteous is but a deception

In the third stanza Leopardi contrasts the cowardly wretch who resigns himself to life and the hero who escapes by suicide In the first type we recognize Foscolo's "*uno di quegli infiniti mortali che infingardi guardano le loro catene*" (p 133) and in the second Ortis himself

The fourth stanza seems to combine Jacopo's apostrophe to Nature (p 125) written at Ventimiglia, with a second one (pp. 134-135) written in the Euganean hills In the first Ortis wonders bitterly why Nature should have added to the "*funesto istinto della vita*" the still more deadly gift of reason, and in the second he accuses Nature of deserting him, and by so doing she has released him from any obligations to her "*Nè io ciedo di ribellarmi da te fuggendo la vita*" (p 135) Leopardi incorporates both these ideas Nature has been untrue to us, hence she will not condemn us if we escape by suicide

The fifth and seventh stanzas, which contrast the happiness of animals with the sadness of man, are not derived from the *Ultime Lettere* But the sixth stanza contains an apostrophe to the Moon recalling Jacopo's words "*O luna, amica luna! . . Tu risorgerai sempre più bella, ma l'amico tuo cadrà deforme e abbandonato cadavere senza risorgere più*" The "*candida luna*" of the *Bruto Minore* will look down equally unmoved on the destruction of Rome.

The final stanza, with its refusal on the part of Brutus to call upon the gods of Heaven or Hell, of Day or Night, which is after all a sort of negative apostrophe, recalls Foscolo's "*O Morte! io ti guardo e t'interrogo*" (p. 137) The same intrepidity in the face of death is shown by the two heroes and the same indifference to their place of burial Ortis asks Lorenzo to bury him "*in un sito abbandonato, di notte, senza esequie, senza lapide*" (p 151), and Brutus consigns his body to the wild beasts and the destruction of the storm.

To summarize in tabular form

<i>Bruto Mmore</i>	<i>Le Ultime Lettere</i>
Stanza	Page
I Italy in ruins	122 Italy in ruins
Foreign invaders	123-124 Foreign invaders
Brutus in solitude	122 Ortis in solitude
II "Stolta virtù"	124 "Virtù," a cloak for evil
"i marmorei dei"	The gods are unjust
III The submissive coward	133 The submissive coward
The suicide-hero	135 Ortis, the suicide hero
IV Nature is cruel	126 Nature cruel in giving mankind reason
Hence suicide is right	135 Hence suicide is right
VI Apostrophe to the Moon	134 Apostrophe to the Moon
VIII Refusal to call upon the gods	137 Apostrophe to Death
No burial rites	151 A simple burial

HILDA L. NORMAN

*University of Chicago*

### THE DATE OF MACHIAVELLI'S *MANDRAGOLA*

Evidence for establishing the date of composition of the *Mandragola* has been found in Act I, sc. 1, where the time and setting of the comedy are indicated, and in the verses of the prologue in which Machiavelli makes excuses for his choice of subject. Aside from Tiraboschi, who sets the date in 1498,<sup>1</sup> critics are divided into two camps. Those of one identify the date of composition with the date of action, 1504, and maintain that the prologue was written later, after Machiavelli's break with the Medici.<sup>2</sup> Another group holds that the prologue and comedy were written contemporaneously, after 1513, during the period when Machiavelli was forced into a life of inactivity.<sup>3</sup> It seems strange, however, that they should have overlooked a reference to Machiavelli's comedy contained in his sonnet to Giuliano de' Medici.<sup>4</sup> This sonnet is not

<sup>1</sup> *St. Lett. Ital.*, Venezia, 1824, VII, 5-7, 1752

<sup>2</sup> Napoli Signorelli, Polidori, Buchon, Borgognoni, Tortoli

<sup>3</sup> Medin, Artaud, Villari, Hillebrand, Gaspary, Tommasini, Sanesi, Osimo, De Benedetti

<sup>4</sup> Mazzoni & Casella, *Tutte le Opere Stor. e Lett. di N. M.*, Firenze, Barbera, 1929, 870-871

dated, but, since Machiavelli was imprisoned only once (Nov. 1512-March 1513), there is no doubt as to the period during which it was written. In it, the Muse invoked by Machiavelli to intercede for him with Giuliano replies

Va al barlazzo  
Con quella tua commedia in guazzeroni

Machiavelli, begging Giuliano for clemency, reminds him that he is a poet and the author of a comedy which he mockingly qualifies "in guazzeroni."<sup>5</sup> So we have it from M himself that by 1512 he had written a comedy which was already known ("quella tua commedia"), if not to the public at large, at least to some of his intimates. The question now arises which comedy, the *Mandragola*, the *Clizia* or the *Andria*? We can dismiss both the *Andria*, which was merely a translation from Terence's play of the same name, and the *Clizia*, an adaptation, and in some parts a translation, of the *Casina* of Plautus. The reference in the sonnet is made to impress Giuliano with the literary abilities of the writer (M's use of a poetic form would seem to confirm this) and to throw a light shadow over his political activities. Both the *Clizia* and the *Andria* lack the wit and originality of the *Mandragola* and added little to the lustre of Machiavelli's reputation. Furthermore, the *Clizia* must have been written much later than the *Mandragola*<sup>6</sup> when the latter had become very popular, as is witnessed by the allusion to it in the third scene of the second act. Just as Machiavelli could refer in the *Clizia* to *Timoteo*, *Lucrezia*, and *Niccia* without fear of not being understood, so could he refer to "quella commedia" in the sonnet with the assurance that it would be immediately recalled. In further support of our argument, we refer the reader to the many references to *Messer Niccia*, *Fra Timoteo*, and "la commedia" found in the private correspondence of the Florentine secretary. These show that the *Mandragola* was Machiavelli's favorite and was not always referred to by name but

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Petrocchi, s.v. *Guazzeroni* "un brano qualunque." Tommaseo-Bellini, s.v. *guazzeroni* "nelle marche è vestito che dal mezzo in giù due gheroni allargano, acciò che il contadino cammini e lavori spedito." This meaning seems to apply here, that is a "commedia da contadino" as opposed to the "comedia palliata" of the Greeks and the "commedia togata" of the Romans.

<sup>6</sup> Tommasini, II, 414 n., Villari, IV, 196.

as "la commedia." A glance at Papini's edition of the *Lettere di N. M.* will prove helpful "questa comedia che ultimamente havete facta recitare" (II, 92), "rispondervi dalla commedia" (II, 109), "e avvisate a che porto è la commedia" (II, 107), ". cinque canzone nuove a proposito della commedia . et questo è quanto alla commedia" (II, 110), "et ragionamo della commedia ." (II, 105) When Della Palla writes to Machiavelli in 1520 regarding the performance of the *Mandragola*, he says simply "Inoltre ho parlato della vostra commedia." That he is referring to the *Mandragola* is clear because in the same letter he continues "A S ta Maria in Portico feci la inbasciata del suo (that is, Bibbiena's) *Calandro* et vostro *Messer Nicia*" It is interesting to note that the play is never referred to in the correspondence as the *Mandragola* and this fact would make it seem that the prologue was not written contemporaneously with the play.<sup>7</sup> If, therefore, the "commedia in guazzeroni" is the *Mandragola*, the sonnet to Giuliano acquires considerable significance and allows us to arrive at a closer approximation of the date of the composition of the comedy While some critics place the date in 1504 and others after 1513 (but not later than 1520), we would say it was between 1504 and 1512.<sup>8</sup>

F -D. COLIMORE

Baltimore

# UN RECUEIL ITALIANISANT DU XVIII<sup>e</sup> SIÈCLE FRANÇAIS

Les *Étrennes du Parnasse* (1770-1790), ou *Chorx de Poesies*, furent une de ces publications périodiques si nombreuses dans le

<sup>7</sup> The prologue was frequently used as a sort of "pezzo d'occasione" Castiglione wrote a special prologue for the *Calandria*, there are two prologues for *Le Pellegrine*, Poliziano wrote a prologue for the *Menecmi*, there are two prologues each for Ariosto's *Lena*, *Negromante*, *Scolastica* Gucciardini (cf Papini, Lett N M, II, 109) asked Machiavelli to write another prologue for the performance of the *Mandragola* at Faenza Had the comedy and prologue both been composed at the same time, it is very probable that the play would have immediately become known by the name *Mandragola*, mentioned in the prologue (La favola *Mandragola* si chiama)

<sup>8</sup> The question is discussed at greater length in our Master's Essay, *Machiavelli's Mandragola*, Johns Hopkins, accepted in 1940

dernier tiers du dix-huitième siècle et dont l'*Almanach des Muses* est peut-être l'exemple le plus typique et le mieux connu. Les *Étrennes* furent vite oubliées, et ne jouèrent, durant les années où elles parurent, que de peu d'estime, malgré les efforts de plusieurs rédacteurs successifs<sup>1</sup>. Il y a cependant quelques volumes du recueil qui présentent de l'intérêt pour les historiens de l'italianisme en France et qui valent la peine d'être brièvement analysés.

Le principal intéressé et le vrai directeur de l'entreprise fut l'éditeur Fétil, libraire de Paris, qui s'avisa d'augmenter le nombre de ses clients en exploitant la vogue courante des livres italiens. Il baptise donc sa librairie "le Parnasse Italien" et donne avis, dans les *Étrennes* de 1778, aux amateurs de la littérature italienne qu'il vient de faire des acquisitions considérables de livres italiens dans tous les genres et sur toutes les matières.

Les *Étrennes* mêmes paraissent sur un nouveau plan et se partagent entre les Muses françaises et les Muses italiennes, pour le plus grand plaisir de ceux qui cultivent les deux genres. "La langue italienne est l'objet des délassemens de presque tous nos littérateurs. Elle est particulièrement cultivée par les Dames qui l'embellissent. La langue de Pétrarque, de l'Arioste, du Tasse & de Métastase, est aussi familière ici que celle des Corneilles, des Racines, des Voltaire & des Buffons l'est au-delà des Alpes," nous déclare l'éditeur,<sup>2</sup> qui fait suivre un "coup d'œil rapide" sur la naissance, les progrès et la décadence de la poésie italienne depuis Dante jusqu'à Métastase. La *Divine Comédie*, malgré la bizarrerie de son invention, a des traits de force, des expressions de génie, qu'on "admire encore". C'est Pétrarque qui est regardé comme le père et le modèle de la bonne poésie italienne. Le siècle d'or de la poésie en Italie est celui représenté par Sannazar, Bembo, Bernardo Tasso, Chiabrera, la Casa, Tansillo, Guarini, Berni "le Marot des Italiens," Caro, Trissino, etc, mais surtout par l'Arioste et le Tasse, "deux Génies sur qui se fonde particulièrement la gloire de la Poesie Italienne". L'Arioste est regardé par beaucoup d'Italiens comme leur premier poète épique, ils lui donnent le titre de *Divin*, "comme les Anglais à leur Shakespear". Ces éloges peuvent être justifiés par "son imagination riche et féconde, la variété de ses portraits, le mouve-

<sup>1</sup> Voir Grimm, *Corr. litt.*, VIII, 446 et IX, 217, *Mercure de France*, oct 1779.

<sup>2</sup> *Étrennes du Parnasse*, 1778, p. 6.



ment de ses personnages, la mollesse de son style enchanteur, malgré sa négligence & ses hyperboles" Quant au Tasse, les Italiens l'appellent leur Virgile et le prince de leur poésie Son poème est regardé comme le plus parfait qui ait paru depuis l'*Enéide*, et l'on admire, avec Voltaire, comment la mollesse de la langue italienne a pris un nouveau caractère sous ses mains, et se change en majesté et en force " On avait atteint à la perfection, il fallait descendre "

Ce volume pour 1778 donne en plus un catalogue des cent principaux poètes italiens, de Guittone d'Arezzo à Francesco Redi et une liste de soixante-neuf poètes vivants au début du siècle Dans le *Choix de poésies*, Fétit, suivant son nouveau plan, inclut des traductions de morceaux choisis dans l'Arioste, Belli, Dante, Guarini, Marino, Métastase, Pétrarque, le Tasse, Zappi et même Ménage, avec des notices sur tous ces poètes<sup>3</sup> Les traducteurs sont Voltaire, de La Doue, "M. Br" et, pour la plus grande partie des morceaux, Simon de Troyes et Gassendi<sup>4</sup>

L'année suivante, le rédacteur des *Étrennes* continue sa propagande pour les poètes italiens et publie une vingtaine de morceaux choisis, texte et traduction Il se propose de donner dans les numéros successifs, en forme de supplément à chaque recueil, une série de notices tirées de la *Storia della volgar Poesia* de Crescimbeni, "qui formera une histoire abrégée de la Poésie italienne" Ce projet est d'autant plus intéressant qu'il n'existait pas encore, en France, d'étude générale sur la littérature de la péninsule<sup>5</sup> Pour

<sup>3</sup> Les *Étrennes* de 1771 contenaient une épigramme de Sannazar et une chanson de Metastase, toutes deux en traduction non signée, avec texte en regard

<sup>4</sup> J-J Basilien de Gassendi, plus tard général, travaillait vers cette époque à une traduction de la *Jérusalem délivrée*, dont sept chants parurent bien plus tard dans *Mes Loisirs*, Dijon, Frantin, 1820 Il a exprimé son jugement sur cet auteur favori dans ces vers *Sur le Tasse*

Sombre, sublime ou tendre et toujours achevé,  
Se pliant sans contrainte à l'art qui le seconde,  
Il soutient la hauteur de son vol élevé,  
J'admire de son plan l'immensité féconde,  
Et lorsqu'au dernier chant le Tasse est arrivé,  
On le croirait un Dieu qui vient finir un monde

<sup>5</sup> Celle de Landi, basée sur Tiraboschi, est de 1784 (Berne) et 1786 (Paris), en 5 vol

ceux de ses lecteurs qui voudraient apprendre l'italien, il donne une liste des maîtres de cette langue domiciliés à Paris.

En 1780 paraissent les premières notices sur soixante-quatorze poètes, d'Ubaldo dal Cerva à Nina Siciliana <sup>6</sup> L'année suivante, c'est le Prévost d'Exmes qui est chargé de préparer ces "essais historiques" Avec ce numéro (1781), on élargit le choix des traductions, et sous le titre de *Poésies étrangères* on présente des pièces imitées non seulement de l'italien, mais encore de l'anglais, de l'allemand, du grec et du latin De nouveaux noms paraissent parmi ceux des traductions Mlle de Vardon, Saint-Lambert, Harduin, le chevalier d'Autumne, auxquels s'ajoutent, en 1782, François de Neuf-Chateau, <sup>7</sup> le Prévost d'Exmes, et Regnault de Chaource En 1783 les *Étrennes* s'impriment chez Couturier fils, premier signe de difficultés Rivarol <sup>8</sup> contribue quelques vers traduits de la *Jérusalem délivrée*, le Prévost publie dans ce numéro sa dernière notice tirée de Crescimbeni, il n'est pas encore arrivé à Dante A part Saint François d'Assise, tous les poètes qu'il a mentionnés sont totalement inconnus en France <sup>9</sup> Aussi le numéro de 1784, publié chez Brunet par un nouveau rédacteur, annonce-t-il que "cette branche de la littérature n'étant pas à la portée de tous les lecteurs, nous croyons qu'on préférera de retrouver à leur place des poésies en tout genre, à l'instar des autres Recueils des Vers" Il n'y a plus aucune traduction ou imitation de l'italien. Peu après, les *Étrennes* meurent

Si l'on en ressuscite le souvenir ici, c'est qu'elles devront avoir leur place, si petite soit-elle, à côté d'autres périodiques comme la *Bibliothèque Italique* et la *Nouvelle Bibliothèque Italique*, dans cette histoire de l'italianisme en France au dix-huitième siècle qui nous manque encore

CHANDLER B. BEALL

*University of Oregon*

---

<sup>6</sup> Pp 7-48, et "Choix de poesies italiennes," pp 49-102

<sup>7</sup> Traducteur de l'Arioste

<sup>8</sup> Traducteur de Dante

<sup>9</sup> Un peu plus tard le Prévost commença un nouveau recueil de *Vies des écrivains étrangers, tant anciens que modernes*, qui a été discontinue après les deux premiers volumes (1781, 1787), qui contenaient entre autres un éloge de Metastase et une vie de Dante

## THE PLURAL USAGE IN JUDAEO-FRENCH

In *Romania*, LIX (1933), Professor H. Pflaum studied a fragment from a Judaeo-French prayer-book, which had served as a binding for an incunabulum of Heidelberg. On page 409 he pointed out that "*ciel* est (ici et partout dans notre texte) au pluriel parce qu'en hébreu aussi le mot ŠAMAYIM, ciel, a la désinence d'un pluriel, comparez le pluriel *eves* en conformité du pluriel MAYIM, eau. Cette particularité se retrouve-t-elle dans d'autres textes juifs de langue vulgaire?" In *The Beginning of Wisdom* (Baltimore, 1939), p. 27, I pointed out two additional texts which used only the plural form *cieus*. Unfortunately, as a result of my not having the opportunity in that edition to suggest an answer to his query, a misunderstanding arose. In *Kurjath Sepher*, xvi (Jerusalem, 1939), p. 360, Pflaum revives the issue saying in part "Does the singular of *cieus* and *eves* appear in Judaeo-French? Hagin le Juif used *cieus* in imitation of the Hebrew plural ŠAMAYIM, and he also used *faces* in imitation of the Hebrew plural PANIM. This latter form *faces* is probably connected with the Judaeo-Spanish *caras*, of which the singular *cara* apparently denotes a cheek. Can we establish, therefore, as a definite characteristic of Judaeo-French the regular use of the plural in those cases?" For the Spanish analogy, incidentally, *caras* can be paralleled by *fazes*, found by L. Wiener, *MLN*, x (1895), 83, in the Ferrara Bible. The observation of L. Spitzer, *ZRPh*, xxxv (1911), p. 272, concerning the proper name *Vidas* (= Hayyim) in the *Poema de Myo Cid*, points to a familiarity with this trait even among non-Jews.

One recalls immediately the late Professor Blondheim's conclusion enunciated in *Les Parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus Latina* (Paris, 1925), p. cxxxvii: "La syntaxe se caractérise naturellement par l'emploi d'hébraïsmes." The Hebraism in this connection is the *pluralia tantum*, which was analyzed lucidly by Lambert, *Revue ét. juives*, xxiv (1892), 108. In order to determine whether servile imitation of the Hebrew plural justifies a syntactical generalization, it behooves us to investigate pertinent constructions in many Judaeo-French texts, for convenience, I shall refer to them by the sigla adopted in the *Recherches lexicographiques sur d'anciens textes français d'origine juive* (Baltimore, 1932), pp. 10-12.

As already noted, Pflaum has shown that *faces*, never *face*, is used in *The Beginning of Wisdom*. Lambert and Brandin, the editors of A, give both "face" and "faces" to translate the nine examples recorded on page 252, but in no instance is the singular absolutely certain, when the possessive adjective is also given, it is in the plural. One may hesitate in choosing the number of *faç* in B folio 6r, F 50r, d 41v for I Samuel 1, 5 and in C folio 105r, D 93r, E 146r for Isaiah XLIX, 23. For the latter passage, the transcription *faase* is given in M, another fragment removed by Bernheimer from a binding around a manuscript of Bologna, but the original reading is the ambiguous *faas*. It seems that *fas* is intended as a singular in G s v PNH. Of the thirteen examples found by Saye in L, seven have the plural *faç*, one has the plural *faseç*, three have the singular *fase*, and two have the singular *fas*.

Anent the Hebrew MAYIM, Pflaum has discussed only two of the three Judaeo-French derivatives of *aqua*. It is a fact that his text gives *eves*, but L has seven examples of *eve* alongside of two in the plural. Likewise Renan and Neubauer have culled the plural *iaues* in U, page 485, from the lexicon of the English rabbi Moses ben Isaac, but in *The Beginning of Wisdom* eight examples of *iaue* are recorded in the glossary on page 139 which include two examples of *iaues*. For the other derivative, it is patent that *ergue* is limited to the singular in both A, Numbers XIX, 13, and G s v. MY.

To return to the most significant word in this study, we have noted that only the plural *cieus* has been recorded for the liturgical fragment published by Pflaum, for the *Glossaire d'Orford* 837 and 1084, and for *The Beginning of Wisdom*, p 131, in addition, all six examples of A on page 282 are in the plural. On the other hand, it is the singular form which is given in G s. v. ŠM as well as on page 10 of W, which is also a liturgical poem in celebration of the advent of the New Year and which was edited by Blondheim.

Professor Pflaum's keen insight, which has been applied with remarkable success to many branches of Romance philology, has now drawn attention to those mediaeval passages containing a plural in contrast to normal usage. As for this problem of syntactical servility, however, there is no consistency evident between one text and another. We have noted, furthermore, that at times within a particular Judaeo-French document the author confused the plural of *face*, *eve*, *iaue*, *ergue*, or *ciel* with the singular. Our

answer, therefore, to the query propounded in the French and Hebrew journals must perforce be negative as to the exclusive use of the *pluraba tantum* in Judaeo-French while granting a certain tendency in this direction

RAPHAEL LEVY

*University of Baltimore*

---

## REVIEWS

---

*The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* By HAZELTON SPENCER  
New York Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1940. Pp xx  
+ 495. \$2.25

A significant fact emerges from Professor Spencer's Foreword to a book which has been awaited with great interest on both sides of the Atlantic. For he is one of the most experienced Shakespearian scholars of the School of Kittredge, and has long been an explorer, and a director of explorations in his own right. There is something like a new, and friendly, Declaration of Independence in all his thought about Shakespeare, and this is interestingly reflected in the list of his acknowledgments to the libraries whose facilities have been at his disposal. An important book on Shakespeare, with a wide scope of enquiry and synthesis, has been prepared and published without any debt to the great English libraries. And the British Museum has for once been found, not wanting, but dispensable. This is a very striking indication of the ample strength and resources of the American libraries in matters Shakespearian, particularly of the Folger Library. Professor Spencer has not even needed to travel Westwards to the Huntington Library. It is well to know that such means of scholarship are available in reasonable security from the new Goths unchained in Europe.

A second fact of immediate significance is the order of the words of Professor Spencer's title. He very rightly places first the 'Art' of Shakespeare as of primary importance. The wheel has come full circle, and high time too. Let us hope that the blessed, lucky idiot Shakespeare of ancient myth is now buried beyond recall, and with him his shadow the mere industrious money-spinner, exposé of uncherished children of undreamt-of genius.

I do not know, however, that we should all agree in our interpretation of the life of Shakespeare as that of an artist. Professor Spencer's preoccupation is throughout, on the whole, with the man of the theatre, and with the play on the stage. The many excellent illustrations in his book reflect this especial interest of his, which

his previous work might have led us to anticipate. He recounts the stage-history of each play, drawing upon his unrivalled knowledge of actual productions. He has even kindly words to say of the filming of the plays, and suggests further opportunities for Hollywood, e.g. in *Julius Caesar*. I confess that my own tendency is to become increasingly preoccupied with the poet Shakespeare, the artist concerned with words and thoughts, with the poem rather than the stage-play or the spectacle. This is not to say that I would relegate Shakespeare to the study or banish him from his principal medium. Far from it, indeed. But I see in Shakespeare more and more the poet ambitious to excel and to vindicate his place among other poets. And in this light I tend more and more to read the whole story of his career as a writer. This is, indeed, the true significance of Shakespeare's *The Phoenix and the Turtle* and of his participation in Chester's *Love's Martyr*, which Professor Spencer dismisses with obvious lack of interest. Yet here is an indication of Shakespeare's place among the Wits of his time, secure from the envious earlier gibes of University critics and rivals, and of his power to bend his bow to this strain, much in fashion and not alien to his own natural strain. He was, in fact, a master-craftsman of words and patterns, not only of the stage-play in verse or prose. I myself agree entirely, by the way, with Professor Spencer's 'own theory' set forth on pp 309-310 (except for the implication in the last sentence of the paragraph). Mr Alfred Hart's recent work certainly backs it up.

On the other hand, Professor Spencer does rare justice to *Titus Andronicus*, which incidentally once again shows us, not the mere purveyor of stage horrors for the groundlings, but the ambitious poet bent on applying himself thus early to the highest form of dramatic poetry, to tragedy, with classical authority for its principal features. And an acute and helpful observation upon King Claudius in *Hamlet* (p 316) springs direct from Professor Spencer's intimacy with stage history and its involvements.

I have my differences with Professor Spencer on other matters of appreciation, e.g. that 'there is not much of a play' in *Coriolanus*, or in his general treatment of *Timon* which, as he suggests, fails to take its chance of being made 'a tragedy of a lonely heart' (p 351). It is, indeed, a tragedy of a lonely mind, perhaps a higher theme. And I am not myself moved to wish that Shakespeare had had Shadwell's right idea of improving Shakespeare by providing a good woman to comfort Timon. I think the evidence is clear against Professor Spencer's suggestion of Shakespeare's way of working upon his dialogue (p 352). Elsewhere too the available evidence affects us differently. He accepts the theory that *Timon* was unfinished and never acted. But the solid evidence that the revels lists are authentic takes him only to a 'probably

genuine' followed by 'ifs' (p 66 and p 415, n 8), and the *More* addition finds him leaning rather upon the authority of Dr Tannenbaum, as he does a good deal, than upon the consensus of the regular army of scholars. Professor Spencer's account of Shakespeare's life continues the old assumption of the poet's 'absence from Stratford' for eleven years and the 'return to Stratford'. Here we have, I believe, another myth. We should rather see the poet throughout dividing his life and activities between the two places, between his work in London and his home and family in the provinces, as with thousands of other Elizabethans of the middle classes.

The expression of such differences is, however, only evidence of one reader's realisation of the stimulating properties of Professor Spencer's book, in which all lovers of Shakespeare will recognise the work of a brother-enthusiast, and all scholars that of a competent authority. The pleasures of agreement, if recorded here, would extend to the unreasonable length of remembered talks in Harvard Yard. The book is a compendium of information, and yet contrives to be individual and critical, the fruit of long and assiduous study and thought. It is assured of its welcome on both sides of the narrowing Atlantic.

As I write these words, facing from my study window an old, solid Saxon village church, which looks out upon the English Channel and awaits tranquilly the next of the daily and nightly storms now bursting round its tower, I recall with comfort the sharp corrective to some present-day values and perspectives that lies in Professor Spencer's quiet observation that the existence of Shakespeare's plays 'is one of the most substantial facts in the world's history.'

C. J. Sisson

*Lyminster, Sussex*

---

*Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642* By FREDSON THAYER BOWERS. Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. x + 290. \$3.00.

Professor Bowers has written one of the most interesting of recent books on Elizabethan drama. Its merit resides less in its parts, that is, its handling of special points, than in its whole, that is, its providing us with a chart which, though it may not be infallible in every detail, constitutes a better outline of the subject and a better description of its principal features than has hitherto been available. The historical and comparative criticism of *Hamlet* that, wielded by Professors Kittredge and Stoll, has demolished the Romantic misconceptions, lays a good deal of emphasis on the genre to which that tragedy belongs and on the folly of considering even so great

and noble a work *in vacuo*. It seems odd that we have had to wait till now for a full exposition of the genre and its peculiar techniques.<sup>1</sup> That is what Mr Bowers gives us, in a treatise that every specialist will have to add to his library and that such general readers of Shakespeare as possess any critical interest at all should find rewarding and much less difficult than academic monographs are popularly supposed to be.

Beginning with a sketch of the previous history of blood revenge, the first chapter summarizes Elizabethan and Jacobean law, custom, religious doctrine, and popular ideas relating to murder and manslaughter, the responsibility of accessories and instigators, private vengeance (and the passions that led to it), duelling (which sharply increased when the horde of Scots arrived with James), and above all the breach between religious teaching and the code of honor and between these and stage convention. "The revenger of the drama started with the sympathy of the audience if his cause were good and if he acted according to the typically English notions of straightforward fair play." The substance of this statement has often been uttered, Mr Bowers makes it after an examination of the background which inspires the reader's confidence that his guide really knows how the spectators must have responded.

Chapter II, on "The Background of the Tragedies," deals with sources in Seneca, in the *novelle*, and in current English opinion of foreigners (especially of Machiavellian villains and exponents of the Italian vendetta).

Chapter III, entitled "The Spanish Tragedy and the *Ur-Hamlet*," defines genres, analyzes *The Spanish Tragedy* at length as "the first great impetus," and reconsiders problems of the pre-Shakespearean versions of the Hamlet story. In handling the last of these topics Mr Bowers proceeds on the assumptions, some of which many students will question, that Kyd (as indeed he may have been) was the author of the *Ur-Hamlet*, that he wrote it before *The Spanish Tragedy* (which Mr Bowers wishes to date in 1587-88 because of "the increasing interest in Spanish affairs at the threat of a Spanish invasion"), that the main features of the *Ur-Hamlet* can be reconstructed in their right order, that both these plays are less indebted to Seneca than to the *novelle*, and that *Der Bestrafte Brudermord*

was drawn from the *Ur-Hamlet* either in its original form or in a somewhat revised version of 1594-1595, and that the *Ur-Hamlet* did not differ materially from the main outline of the story as represented in the German play and in the first quarto of Shakespeare.

Though Mr Bowers does not choose to focus his book on the relevance of the genre's history to interpretive problems in *Hamlet*,

<sup>1</sup> The subject has not, of course, gone undiscussed. See, for example, A. H. Thorndike, "The Relations of *Hamlet* to Contemporary Revenge Plays," *PMLA*, xvi (1902), 125-220, and Lily B. Campbell, "Theories of Revenge in Renaissance England," *MP*, xxviii (1931), 281-296.



perhaps the most striking single remark in this chapter is the suggestion that the Prince must die, not merely in order "to end with a holocaust of pity and terror," but because he has killed the innocent courtier (Corambis-Polonius) and "no revenger, no matter how just, ever wholly escapes the penalty for shedding blood even in error." This decision, of such far-reaching artistic importance, Mr Bowers attributes to Kyd. Whoever made it, the problem it solves seems to me more likely to have arisen in the cold-sober mind of a dramatist blocking in his plot than in the emotions of an audience watching a hero at a play. I doubt whether it was so much despair of securing the right collective response in the theater as fear of pious reprobation outside it that influenced a playwright, and I should guess (at this point all anyone can do is guess) that purely aesthetic considerations and the example of Seneca were more powerful than either of these apprehensions. When Mr Bowers lays down as a generalization the assertion that the audience remains sympathetic to a revenger only "so long as he does not become an Italianate intriguer, and so long as he does not revenge," it may be suspected, at any rate in his final clause, that the historian is bringing the background into the foreground. His contention, if true, would afford a neat solution for the alleged problem of the hero's delay (of course it is not so intended), but on Shakespeare's stage Prince Hamlet "pleased all." However spectators may have felt about the swordthrust through the arras (and even here one may question the degree of shock), surely their delight in him and their approval of him were undiminished by the killing of either Laertes or Claudius or by his responsibility for the execution of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern.

Chapter IV deals with "The School of Kyd," 1587-1607, though *The Atheist's Tragedy*, *The Revenge of Bussy*, and *Valentinian* are also considered, as later examples of the same thing, at least in form. It was *The Spanish Tragedy* (and in Mr Bowers's opinion the *Ur-Hamlet*, too) that "set the major pattern for tragedies which did not imitate . . . *Tamburlaine*." Marlowe modified the form, but Mr Bowers argues that "Kyd's Lorenzo was the prototype of Barabas and . . . the action of *The Jew of Malta* is merely an elaboration of similar action in *The Spanish Tragedy*." He believes that Marlowe consciously began developing the Kydian villain into the protagonist. In *Titus Andronicus*, Shakespeare tries to outdo Kyd's blood and horror; in *Antonio's Revenge*, Marston extends the Italianate features, in *Hoffman*, Chettle makes the avenger "a villain from the start." In fact, all the revenge tragedies are thus analyzed with reference to the two supposed originals, *The Spanish Tragedy* and the *Ur-Hamlet*. The result is an ingenious and useful but often hypothetical pattern of development, and perhaps insufficient allowance is made for originality, mere coincidence, and independent resort to foreign and ancient examples. In *Antonio's Revenge*, for instance, Marston's solution of his structural problem,

according to Mr Bowers, "combined the methods" of the *Ur-Hamlet*, *The Spanish Tragedy*, and *Titus Andronicus*. This chapter, too, is actually a study of possible sources, not so much of plots as of plotting. It is not always entirely convincing, but it brings forward important relationships that have hitherto passed unnoticed.

Chapter V, "Interlude The Reign of the Villain," covers the second phase, 1607-1620, when the popular audience demanded "even more shocking scenes of blood and violence." The villain is now "invariably raised to the position of protagonist. Strong sensation is substituted for strong emotion, and artificial points of honor for an inherent moral code. . . . Revenge tends to be overshadowed by emphasis on situation and intrigue." But the plays of this period admittedly range very widely from this norm, among those discussed are *Women Beware Women*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, and the twin masterpieces of Webster.

In Chapter VI, "The Disapproval of Revenge," we come to the third phase and a group of tragedies in which condemnation of private vengeance, often implied during the second period, is unequivocally expressed. The dates are 1620-1630, but Mr Bowers does not maintain that his divisions are precise or his categories free from overlapping. Here he includes *A Fair Quarrel* (1616) and *The Fatal Dowry* (1619). Massinger is the typical dramatist of this phase, other notable practitioners are Rowley, Middleton, Ford, and D'Avenant.

In Chapter VII we witness "The Decadence of Revenge Tragedy." Shirley, the leading figure, "turned to the past . . . re-arranging the best of the older drama's incidents and characters", in utilizing revenge he "is usually free from the implications of the third period."

Chapter VIII, "Conclusion," runs over the contemporary criticism, such as it was, of the revenge play. Mr Bowers reverts to the question of Senecan influence, which (like Howard Baker, *Induction to Tragedy*, University, Louisiana, 1939) he seems desirous of minimizing. Yet he flatly asserts that "the Elizabethans in conceiving of tragedy as replete with violent action were indebted to Seneca . . . and the Elizabethan tragedy of revenge undoubtedly drew upon him for its initial inspiration," especially in the *Medea*, *Thyestes*, and *Agamemnon*. Subsequent development is ascribed chiefly to Italian sources. Mr Bowers rejects the theory of a comparable influence by Marlowe on the villain and the villain play. Once again it is possible that background comes into foreground in an exaggeration of the importance of the contemporary ethical position, Mr Bowers thinks Professor Tucker Brooke and others have "obscured" its significance.

The great tragic theme of sixteenth—and seventeenth—century teaching is this theme of God's revenge for sin. Writers of tragedies, both dramatic and non-dramatic tragedies, were necessarily preoccupied with this fundamental teaching.

Writers of nondramatic tragedies, yes, but men who were "pre-occupied" with the "fundamental teaching" of anything were not the men who gravitated to the stage and became actors or playwrights or both

The entering of occasional exceptions (others arise from the lack of a bibliography and from the inadequate index) must not, however, be permitted to veil the gratitude drama students owe the author of this valuable monograph

HAZELTON SPENCER

*The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605-1625* By GEORGE FULLMER REYNOLDS Modern Language Association of America, General Series, IX. New York Modern Language Association of America, London Oxford University Press, 1940 Pp. x + 204. \$2.00

Professor Reynolds, who has made important contributions to our conceptions of Elizabethan staging (e. g., *MP*, II [1905], 581-614, III [1905], 69-97, IX [1911], 47-82), begins with a denial that everything is "fairly settled and established" and a protest against "too many generalizations from a few instances." Presumably he was thinking of some of Dr W J Lawrence's conclusions, certainly the work of that great theatrical antiquarian is sometimes open to question on just such grounds. The caveat on the state of our knowledge is sound. Yet Mr. Reynolds's choice of the Red Bull, while logical enough, has its limitations. What everyone wants to know about the Elizabethan theater is how it staged Shakespeare. The Red Bull was probably not built till close to 1605, Shakespeare's company never played there, and anyway it was not a typical theater. "A plain man's playhouse," Dr Louis B Wright has called it (*Middle Class Culture*, p 609), "where clownery, clamor, and spectacle vied with subject matter flattering to the vanity of tradesmen." There is also the well-known complaint of John Webster.

Nevertheless, Mr Reynolds performs a needed service in reviewing all the pertinent stage directions of the Red Bull plays. His book should be read in connection with Mr Lawrence's valuable but less systematic *The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse*, which it supplements and corrects. Mr Reynolds handles the evidence with a real feeling for the stage as a medium and vehicle, and out of his long familiarity with all that has survived concerning it offers many a wise observation. Naturally, there is bound to be dissent on some points. For example, I think he takes the Dutch sketch of the Swan far too seriously. Indeed, it may be doubted whether any of the extant pictorial evidence is worth much till at least a later date than Rowe's 1709 Shakespeare, the illustra-

tions of which probably embody, as I have argued, small relevance to the stage ("How Shakespeare Staged His Plays Some Notes on the Dubiety of Non-textual Evidence," *Johns Hopkins Alumni Magazine*, xx [1932], 205-221) Mr Reynolds's predilection inclines him, I believe unwarrantably, against oblique side doors. The truth is, as he reiterates, that on a number of even fundamental matters we remain ignorant

Among numerous interesting conclusions are the following

What most of [the Elizabethans] seemed to work for and delight in was a—to us—strange mixture of realism and imagination

The trees always, the throne often, and the beds sometimes were shown on the open, front stage The altar was apparently discovered; the scaffold, the barriers, and the lists seem to have been placed on the front stage, as were also the well and the spring, the Red Bull plays leave the position of the [courtroom] bar, the tomb, and the rack uncertain The tent, the shop, and the arbor sometimes at least were structures separate from the rear stage

He who ventures to illustrate his opinions on the Elizabethan stage by means of a diagram presents fortune with a hostage, even if he labels it conjectural Mr Reynolds exhibits all a sound scholar's caution in his anxiety to avoid dogmatism, but he might have been a little more reckless and helped us visualize his ideas. All students of these problems will be grateful for his careful monograph, with its wealth of detail, tabulation, and bibliographical reference Its format is a substantial improvement over the last M L A volume I reviewed in this journal

HAZELTON SPENCER

*The Icelandic Physiologus Facsimile Edition with an Introduction.*

By HALLDOR HERMANNSSON *Islandica*, Vol. xxvii Ithaca, New York, 1938 Pp 21.

The Old Icelandic 'Physiologus' consists of two small fragments, the one of two leaves, the other of seven. A lithographic reproduction of them which had been made ca 1850 may be found in V Dahlerup's diplomatic edition published in *Aarbøger for nordisk Oldkyndighed og Historie* (1889). But this was inexact in several places, it has therefore been republished in facsimile in the study before us. The facsimile is an excellent and a beautiful one, which I am sure, gives us a correct picture of the fragments in their present state. It is seen, however, that the text is now badly damaged, especially in the last two leaves, likewise the painted figures in leaves 2, 5, 6 and 7. But by consulting the lithograph made nearly a century ago the editor has been able to offer a complete text of these interesting and very important fragments<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Arne Magnusson discovered the fragments in Iceland presumably in, or about, 1662; and it was no doubt a part of the collection of manuscripts

In view of the fact that we have the diplomatic text in the Dahlerup study, the editor felt that it was unnecessary to give such a transcription here, he offers, instead, an Old Icelandic normalized text, which feature he considers will aid the reader to better understand the pictures. But this normalized orthography and forms, with its *dv*, *gv*, *hv*, etc., for *du*, *gu*, *hu*, its *j* for consonantal *i*, *i* and *u* in weak final syllables instead of *e* and *o*, *ð* (except initially) instead of the universal *þ* of the original, *sk* for *sc*, etc., gives us a text that differs considerably from the fragments. Other kinds of departures are *aptr* for *aftir*, *hæstu* for *hestu*, *er* and *var* for *es* and *vas*, *fugl* for *fögl*, *hun* for *hon* and *hön*, *fæzlu* for *fötslo*, etc. Again *sáþr*, B4, is changed to *sannr* (*múþr*, B3, however, is retained as *muðr*), and *søfr* and *trøþr* in B are changed to *sefr* and *treðr*. I feel that the editor should have given some information about the scope of the changes from the original that the normalization necessitated, since the work is clearly intended both for the general reader and the Old Icelandic specialist.

I have found a few errors. *að*, in A § 1, p 17, should be *at*, *dæ mum*, B § 3, for *dæmum*, *høfut*, B § 4, for *høfuð* (the fragment has *hofoð*), *sætr*, B § 7, for *sætr* (the fragment has *søti*), *muðr*, B § 6, for *múðr*, *afækjask*, B § 9, for *afækjast*, *þær*, B § 12, for *þa er*, and *grpendur*, B § 16, for *grpendr*. It will be observed that several of these represent the Icelandic change of *æ* to *ø*, in all of which cases the MS has *ø*. I call attention to the fact that there is one instance of the writing with unrounded vowel, namely *sete* in A, which is changed to *sæti* in the editor's normalized text, p 17.

And this brings me to the question of the date of the fragments. It is generally held that they go back to ca 1200. This dating seems to me a little too early. The writing *sete* mentioned above indicates that the copyist spoke an *ø* that was no longer a pure fully rounded *æ*. Further the inverted writing *sø* for *sæ* appears in B, 3 recto, which shows the same thing. Again there is the form *hæroþ*, B, 1 recto. These scribal errors seem to point rather definitely to a date in the second quarter of the XIIIth century, or ca 1240.

Hermannsson has a valuable Introduction on the extent of foreign influence upon early Icelandic literature, and especially upon the pictures of animals scattered through the MS as illustrations of the content.

GEORGE T. FLOM

University of Illinois

---

that he brought to Copenhagen that year. Thus it had remained in good condition for ca. more than 400 years in private hands in Iceland, and in Copenhagen for some 185 years more, when the lithographic facsimile was made.

*Problems in German Literary History of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries* By ARCHER TAYLOR. (The Modern Language Association of America General Series VIII, New York), 1939 (xviii + 212 pp.). \$2.00.

This book, dedicated by the author to his teacher John A. Walz, deals with problems in German history of the late Middle Ages and the beginning of modern times. The first part of the book presents problems of a general nature, such as surveys and bibliographies of the whole period, special bibliographies, private library catalogues, changes in the meaning and use of a characteristic word, formulae describing racial peculiarities, the history of international literary relations, translations, and foreign and technical words in German. The second part is concerned with problems encountered in the study of an author, such as his biography, the connection between his life and works, his influence, the edition of his works, authenticity and ascriptions, dedications of books, the characterization and adaptations of a book, the sequence of the author's works, typography and printing, and the interpretation of a text. In the third part the author delves into problems of the literary history of a genre and treats *e. g.* Saints' legends, allegorical love poetry, rhymed chronicles, heraldic verse, preaching, parodies, the 'Lügenlied,' letter writing, proverbs, jest books, the history of themes, literary conventions, stylistic devices, the geography of ideas and literary forms, the city-poem etc. The fourth part is occupied with problems in the history of ideas, such as ideas of marriage, handbooks on marriage, the devil literature, the inter-relation between literature and art etc. The book concludes with five appendices, containing a critical biography of the cultural and literary history of Strassburg 1 E, catalogues of private libraries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and bibliographies of the language of German hunters, the city-poem and the history of marriage. The book ends with a rich index of subjects and a complete index of proper names.

This book is meant chiefly for the American student who is led by a guiding hand through the intricate labyrinth of these two conflicting centuries. On the basis of a survey of literature, the two auxiliary sciences, bibliography and text edition, are cleverly used for the presentation of hundreds of literary problems connected with the above items. Of course, the extension of the research work involved is closely related to the library facilities at the student's disposal and a few of the problems indicated, especially those of an inter-European character, might best be solved in the study rooms of European libraries, but the author shows how most problems can be tackled successfully even with the help of a modest library. No doubt, interlibrary loans, the photostat and the unavoidable 'Leica,' so characteristic of the twentieth century re-

search worker, are indispensable for a more extensive undertaking. The questions asked are so searching that the answers, even those given in the affirmative or negative, must go to the core of the subject and of necessity present a methodically developed enrichment of the field in question. Since the author cannot reasonably be expected to have asked the legion of scholars and students in Europe the subjects of their research enterprises just now under consideration or nearing completion, there is the possibility that the solutions of a few of the problems are being completed (*e g*, the edition of *Belial*) or have been published, but, as is the case with doctoral dissertations, research work will but benefit by overlapping and even by identical investigations. The reader of the book will indubitably miss some of the themes which lie in his specialized field and which he regards as 'the most important'. In fact, one could suggest some additions, *e g* in the field of *Erbauungsliteratur*, the biblical influences, natural science, the *secretum secretorum* etc, but it would be unfair to ask the author the impossible, *v. e* to enumerate the thousands of problems hidden in the relatively untouched field of research work of these two centuries. He himself, therefore, says correctly (p. vii) "I have not sought to enumerate many problems which a historian of literature might try to solve." Reticence about religious subjects, emanating from a feeling of decency, excludes many a problem which is important to the history of these two religious centuries, but what is more sacred to a modern scholar than the religious conviction of another? The pertinence of the authors repeatedly drawn parallels with English research work, which *mutatis mutandis* can in so many cases furnish the pattern for similar investigation in German literature, gives importance and vitality to his subject. The author shows a profound understanding of the two centuries, so different in structure and character, and we are especially thankful for his fair treatment of the fifteenth century, ever the stepchild of German literature. The book, clear in arrangement and attractive in form, is remarkably free of the inevitable printing mistakes and errors (read *sur* for *zur*, p. 33, line 29). In spite of the more than 1600 titles and names given, mostly in foreign languages, only once is a name mutilated. The author of *The Delphic Maxims in Literature* is Eliza G. 'Wilkins,' not 'Watkins' (p. 26, line 5).

No doubt, the book offers more than its title modestly indicates. From its well rounded bibliographical notes and its clear presentation of the problems, reminding us of an *Aufriss* rather than a survey, we gain an inside look into these centuries as though through many little windows, an approach, which is in many cases more informative than an elucidating essay. In the variety of subjects treated it approaches a *Kulturmorphologie* in the sense of the *Bonner Schule*. It is needless to emphasize that it is a most welcome gift in many respects. It offers a survey of literary developments of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it points out

hundreds of worthwhile problems which involve major developments as well as single phases, it gives practical advice to the young research worker. Thus it is indispensable to teacher and student. The Modern Language Association must be congratulated on the publication of this splendid book.

CARL SELMER

*Hunter College of the City of New York*

---

*Vrastmunt Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Wortgeschichte*,  
von ERIK ROTH Beilage *Das Mainzer Friedgebot vom*  
*Jahre 1300. Lunder Germanistische Forschungen, Nr 9*  
1939, pp. 90 Kr. 3,50 (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift, N F  
Avd. 1 Bd. 36. Nr 5)

Ehrismanns Anregung, das ritterliche Tugendsystem zu untersuchen, war bei Naumann und seinem Kreise auf fruchtbaren Boden gefallen und als deren greifbare Frucht tritt uns zu Anfang der ritterlichen Periode der seelisch gehobene, aristokratische *hohe muot* entgegen, dem sich dann gegen das Ende des Mittelalters zu das mehr demokratisch anmutende *freie gemute* gegenüberstellt. Rooths Verdienst nun ist es, mhd *vrastmunt* etymologisch und semasiologisch durch die Jahrhunderte zu verfolgen und begrifflich gleichsam als Tangente an beide Formeln, besonders an das *freie gemute*, heranzuführen. Bewährten Vorbildern folgend, die den *hohen muot* mit der aristotelischen *megalopsychia* und das *freie gemute* mit der ciceronischen *magnanimitas* in Zusammenhang bringen, kann der Verfasser seiner *vrastmunt* die christliche *fiducia* in überzeugender Weise zugrunde legen. In langer Linie folgen Belege und Bedeutungsentwicklung, wozu letztere sich um "Kraft, Zuversicht, Freimutigkeit, Selbstbewusstsein, Kuhnheit" kristallisiert. Wiederum ist es das Verdienst Rooths, wenn wir Lexen über die übliche Bedeutung hinaus ins Zerrbild dieses Begriffes, also zu "Trotz, Übermut, Vermessenheit" im ethisch negativen Sinne erweitern können. Das Wort ist dialektisch im Mhd auf das Bairische beschränkt und—welcher Bavarophile sagte hier nicht schmunzelnd *Des wortes habet dank, herr Erich*—ist "eine alte Bezeichnung für bajuwarische—und deutsche—Seelenfrische und Herzhaftigkeit".

Weniger Wert legt der Verfasser offenbar auf die Beilage, das Mainzer Friedgebot vom Jahre 1300. Das Verdienstvolle dieser Ausgabe besteht darin, dass er als Beweis für die um 1300 noch nordwärts gegen Köln-Trier gerichtete Einstellung der Mainzer Urkundensprache, die bekanntlich erst später nach dem Süden abdrehte, einige Kriterien anführen kann *bit* (mit), *bit* (bis), *u>u>au* (*vure*), *u>o* (*vonf*), *wel* (welcher), Metathese des *r*



(*burnt*), *hiner* (jener). Diese zweifelsohne einwandfreien Feststellungen werden bei dem heiklen Charakter der Uikundensprache durch weitere Arbeiten über Wilhelms *Corpus der altdt. Originalurkunden bis 1300* wohl noch bestätigt und abgerundet werden müssen. Wie naheliegend wäre es auch hier für Rooth gewesen, sich auch beim Herausgebungsverfahren an dieses Monumentalwerk anzulehnen und die anerkannte Methode des leider nur zu früh heimgegangenen Meisters zugrunde zu legen. Da es nicht nur schwer, sondern vielleicht auch unrecht ist, nur auf Grundlage einer verglichenen Faksimileseite urteilen zu wollen, muss man dem zu *vnde* (75, 24) aufgelosten *vñ* (Linie 96) bei 14 maligem un- abgekürzten *vnd* auf derselben Seite zum mindesten etwas beklommen gegenüber stehen. Bei allen Abkürzungen, die eine zweifache Auflösung gestatten, ist die nicht aufgeloste Form entschieden vorzuziehen.

Auf jeden Fall reiht sich Rooths Abhandlung würdig an die Serie der Lunde- Germ. Forschungen und bildet einen weitvollen Beitrag zur mhd. Wortgeschichte.

CARL SELMER

*Hunter College of the City of New York*

*The Poetical Works of John Keats* Edited by H. W. GARROD  
Oxford: Clarendon Press [New York: Oxford U. Press], 1939  
Pp. lxxxix + 572 \$10.00.

This book marks a further important advance in the assembling and publication of evidence about the poems of Keats. Professor Garrod has essayed a complete variorum edition in the light of a fresh examination of the impressively large mass of manuscript material in autograph and transcript now available to students of Keats. There can be, on the whole, only praise for the industry and scholarly care with which Mr. Garrod has done his work. His collations, insofar as he has seen the manuscripts or photographs of them, are thorough and are commendably accurate. He has brought to enrich his pages many recent discoveries, some of them his own, including two hitherto unpublished sonnets. In establishing a text he has adopted the sensible criterion, to which he usually adheres, of letting the versions of the volumes published by Keats stand as Keats left them, and of printing poems not so published from a collation, to the extent that the material is to be had, of the best of known manuscripts. This text is one, therefore, in which the reader can have confidence. It will certainly stand for many years to come among the most authentic of Keats editions.

It must be admitted, however, that Professor Garrod's editing is

not impeccable, and that, assiduous as his researches have been, there are still gaps in his acquaintance with the manuscripts. One of the most extensive and valuable of all Keats collections in America, that of Arthur Houghton of Corning, New York, for example, is not mentioned in the book. On occasion, manuscripts that are in collections Mr Garrod has examined have escaped notice, one of these is the important autograph fragment of "The Eve of St. Mark" in the Morgan Library. There is consequently no record in the notes of several variants in this autograph, one of which occurs in line 100, where Keats first wrote "That han to decide" (with 'to' evidently traced over 'the'), crossed this out and set down the line, "Men han who sleep to waken in Bliss," then deleted the last six words of this and substituted "beforne thy [they] waken in Blis"; other unnoted variants in this autograph are 'natavitie' for 'nativitie' in line 105, 'Satan's' for 'Sathan's' line 109. 'Of' over 'Bot' (perhaps 'But') in line 111, and 'auctourth' for 'autourethe' in line 113.

There are further lapses in notation of variants. Thus, in transcribing the four cancelled lines in the second Young autograph fragment of "I Stood Tip-toe," Mr. Garrod prints 'among' in line 122c where the original plainly reads 'of all', and he omits notice of the fact that for the printed reading of line 78, "If you but scantily hold out your hand," the first Young autograph has "And if we but scarcely wave the hand."

Some of Mr. Garrod's editorial decisions are not easy to follow. If, for instance, a new version of "God of the golden bow" is to be printed why select the Woodhouse transcript in the Morgan Library rather than the excellent autograph in the same collection? A matter more dubious is the inclusion in the text of the poem "See, the ship . . ." from the Morgan Woodhouse book especially in view of the editor's own remarks that he has "no belief in its authenticity" (lxvi) and that in manner it is "strangely unlike Keats" (lxviii). Woodhouse, moreover, notes that Keats had denied its authorship, and other scholars have consistently rejected it as a Keats poem. The few alterations from Keats's published texts usually appear justified, it is difficult, however, though the fair copy furnishes some authority, to see the logic of disjuncting both the grammar and meaning of line 14 of *Endymion* I, by substituting "Trees old, and young sprouting a shady boon" for "Trees old and young, sprouting a shady boon" of the 1818 text.

Readers of this book will, I fear, find it inconvenient. The *apparatus criticus* is troublesome and is made more so by the fact that many symbols do not occur in the table of signs, but are introduced piecemeal later. In the interests of conserving space the notes are so abbreviated that when variants are numerous, they appear unpleasantly and rather unintelligibly huddled. The arrangement of the poems affords further difficulty, with all too many

divisions and distinctions When in reading the "Ode on Melancholy" one glances at the notes for the rejected stanza, is directed there to page 501, and must then turn for the lines (on page 502, it develops) to a section headed "Shorter Poems from the Memoir." initial disappointment becomes annoyance There is a final section hazardously labelled "Trivia," which contains such verses as "The Gothic looks solemn," "For there's a Bishop's teign," "Acrostic," and "Pensive they sit", if these, it may be inquired, why not "To Miss Reynolds's Cat," "Before he went to feed," "Character of Charles Brown," "Stanzas on some Skulls," and a half-dozen others?

To mention flaws is, however, less pleasant than to emphasize the general excellence of this edition The strong side of Professor Garrod's book is that it presents an admirable, inclusive text, based on rarely fine scholarship, and much new material for the study of Keats as a craftsman It cannot, it is true, be called a definitive edition, in the sense that the last word has here been spoken, but it is, perhaps, as nearly definitive as could be expected at this time Scholars will find it an invaluable aid in further research.

CLARENCE DE WITT THORPE

*University of Michigan*

*Matthew Prior, Poet and Diplomatist.* By CHARLES KENNETH EVES New York Columbia University Press, 1939 Pp viii + 436 \$4.00 (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, No 144)

Although this is avowedly a "sympathetic" biography, deliberately avoiding disparagement of its subject, it is greatly to the credit of the book that it does not confuse fairness with partisanship and does not distort facts in order to present Prior in a favorable light As an interpretation of Prior's character, indeed, it does not differ radically from the most recent previous studies It improves upon them, however, by being more scholarly than Bickley's *Life* and more complete than Wickham Legg's work on Prior's public career Mr. Eves has made full use of the manuscripts in the British Museum, the Public Records Office, and the French Archives, and has uncovered other pertinent manuscript materials never before utilized He has also taken advantage of all the important studies of Prior, of his contemporaries, and of his times that were published up to 1937 (the latest date in the bibliography)

These researches have led to a few "discoveries," the most important of which is evidence of the respectability of Prior's parentage More frequently, they have furnished details which give depth

and color to the portrait and thus have contributed to one of the greatest virtues of the book its success in making Matt Prior come to life before the reader. By skilful use of background material and apt quotation from the private writings of Prior and his acquaintances, Mr. Eves manages to give a vivid picture of the man and his relation to the events and people of his age.

There is, of course, danger inherent in any such attempt to vivify documentary evidence. Particularly where source material is meager, as for the period treated in the first two chapters, Mr. Eves has a tendency to fill in the gaps with statements of what *might* be true, without making it perfectly clear that he is engaging in conjecture. Sometimes, too, his analysis of Prior's reactions and motives goes beyond the evidence presented. Occasionally his admirable attempt to draw on Prior's poems for intimate detail exceeds the bounds of exact scholarship. For instance, he makes more of Prior's "wooing" of Elizabeth Singer than his evidence warrants. This weakness also leads to the most serious error in the book: the too facile identification of the mistresses referred to in Prior's verses. He makes the tacit assumption that Prior had only one Cloe, then, on the basis of an absurd statement that Mrs. Cox is reported to have made during a drinking bout, he states that Cloe was "doubtless" Flanders Jane. This he feels justifies his applying to Cloe phrases taken from "Jinny the Just," a poem which according to his own evidence originally referred to a girl named Lundy. This mistake, and also the erroneous statement that Prior was confined at the house of Sergeant Wibergh, might have been avoided if Mr. Eves had made use of articles on Prior published since 1937.

The book is supplied with an extensive bibliography; and the documentary footnotes are numerous, although not given at every point where they are needed. The exact date of Prior's birth is still too much a question to be stated dogmatically without reference to authority, and the assertion that Prior received four thousand guineas for the 1718 edition of his poems requires more cogent evidence than that mentioned in the text.

In spite of the fact that there is more material available on Prior's public career than on his literary activities, Mr. Eves has, with some success, tried to avoid overemphasizing this aspect of Prior's life. In addition to giving considerable information concerning the composition and publication of Prior's works, he has brought together much of the most useful critical comment on Prior's writings and has added some intelligent judgments of his own.

H. BUNKER WRIGHT

*Miami University*

---

*Thomas Carlyle and the Art of History* By LOUISE MERWIN  
YOUNG. Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939.  
Pp x + 219 \$2 00.

One may say at the outset, and with small chance of contradiction, that Mrs. Young has written an excellent book, well conceived, well organized and unusually well written. It should be, and doubtless will be, read by a large number of those who are interested in Carlyle, in history and in literature generally. There has been far too little of this kind of work done by those who profess themselves "historians," whether in conducting such studies of others or in applying such criteria to their own work. For history to many of them has been like the classic story of its definition by the book-seller—"History?" said he, "why history is *history*," and so closed the discussion. But history, as Mrs. Young points out by precept and example, is a Protean thing. It changes form not only from generation to generation but from individual to individual, and it is well worth while to consider, as one must in reading her book, not only what it is but what purpose it serves.

To this great problem her book naturally does not, and does not profess to, give an answer, but there is much of it implicit in her pages. Her title defines the purpose of her study, limiting, as it does, her subject to the Art of history as practiced by Carlyle, and by that word Art eliminating for the most part the consideration of what is called the "science of history" from much consideration. In that she—and Carlyle—have been fortunate, for almost the most subjective of English historians would not, perhaps, have fared so well at her hands had the "science" of history been more considered. Her quotation from Schiller as to his own work is not, indeed, wholly applicable to Carlyle, but it has much bearing on the problem. "I shall always be a poor authority for any future investigator who has the misfortune to consult me," he wrote. "But perhaps at the expense of historic truth I shall find readers, and here and there I may hit upon the other kind of truth which is philosophic." "What, asked jesting Pilate, is truth, and paused for an answer." The difference between the idea expressed by Schiller and those so often propounded by Carlyle is that to Carlyle what Victor Hugo called "the penetration of genius" tended to become in Carlyle's hands primal truth. No one can read his characterizations of men and events, revealed to him like the Ten Commandments from on high, without feeling that he had some sense of immanent infallibility which transcended the mere accumulation of evidence. That he had flashes of insight none would deny, that his judgments were as infallible as the casual reader might gather from his words, no one conversant with the subjects of which he writes could possibly believe. In the field of history, as in that of social

concerns of his own time, he tended to hand down irrefutable dogmas in his capacity as prophet priest and king

That is what gives his work such a hold on the imagination of his readers—that and his compelling style, and he has, and will continue to have, enthralled readers and faithful devotees. He has become more than a historian, he is a cult, and there is no disputing with a faith which transcends mere works. He made a great contribution to both history and literature, yet it may be doubted whether he had the saving grace which Schiller expressed in his separation of “truth” and “readers” as the goal. And in one other respect Carlyle may be considered as somewhat less than generous—it is the contempt he lavishes on his favorite “Dryasdust,” the previous workers in the same field, from whom he derived most of the materials which he used and on whom he pours the vitals of his wrath. That does not, naturally, come within the scope of a work devoted to his “art” but it has some bearing on his position in the world of historiography.

Yet after all, when all is said and done, whatever one may think of that exhibition of rhetorical fireworks which is known as “Carlyle’s French Revolution”—which in more senses than one it emphatically is—or his “Cromwell” or—least of all, though probably his greatest purely historical work—his “Frederick the Great,” he was essentially a stylist not a scholar, a man of enormous and fertile historical imagination, not a man of long and industrious searching after truth wherever that search might lead and to whatever conclusions. He saw the end from the beginning, he knew where he was going, he carried his readers with him and made them as certain as he was that what he saw along the way was basically and eternally Right and all else was Wrong. Unhampered by doubts, unafflicted with humility, sure of himself and of his beliefs, filled with compelling eloquence, this man of whom it might be said, as he was fond of saying of some of his heroes, he had “fire in his belly,” himself possessed something of that heroic quality which he worshipped in others. For him life like a dome of many-coloured glass did not break the white soul-light of eternity. The gleams he had of truth seemed the whole of truth to him, and if we cannot believe the whole of what he wrote, we can recognize that in his case, as in that of so many others, his art of presentation of the past proved to many minds its superiority to the nature of that past, even though his nineteenth century libertarianism seems a bit outmoded to a totalitarian twentieth century, so full of the “heroes” whom he apotheosized but whom he would doubtless have hated in real life.

W C ABBOTT

*Harvard University*

---

*The History of the English Novel*, Vol x—Yesterday By ERNEST  
A BAKER London H F and G Witherby, 1939 Pp 420  
16 sh

With this tenth volume Dr Baker's monumental work closes, and he is to be congratulated on a fine achievement. He has given us so much that it would be ungenerous to indicate what he has not provided. Each chapter in itself might have been expanded into a book, and if he was to observe a sense of proportion certain aspects of his subject had to be curtailed. Biographical, sociological and formal considerations have suffered reduction if not elimination, and the writer has focussed his attention upon the books rather than upon the authors and their background. The value of his whole achievement derives from the sanity and liveliness of his literary judgments. In the older periods he has of course tradition to guide him, and his attitude of mind tends to be conservative. When he comes to the present time Dr. Baker is more free to take a line of his own, but that we should sometimes dissent from his view is no impairment to the accuracy or honesty of his survey.

This volume deals with the novelists who have died since 1924, and the amplest space is devoted to such writers as Conrad, Kipling, Barrie, Bennett, Galsworthy, Butler, Katherine Mansfield and Lawrence. In the case of all these writers the treatment is sympathetic and discerning, with some critical qualification however in the appraisement of Kipling and Barrie.

Kipling, in fact, was a much narrower-minded person than he looks at the first glance. His interests were far-reaching, but his thinking was not so penetrating and infallible as he and his more fervid admirers believed. He had the gifts of the heaven-born journalist, with something super-added, which was, however, not the universality of the philosophic mind but the quickening imagination of the poet. His was a practical philosophy, and hence almost necessarily a shallow one. He reiterates a few simple ideas, with great force but often small insight.

This quotation is not introduced to prove a point about Kipling, but to indicate that Dr. Baker is something more than an acquiescent historian and recorder of facts. So far as Kipling is concerned it might be urged that disproportionate space is given to a man whose books, whatever high merit we accord them, lie chiefly in the short story classification. Less space but much higher praise is accorded Katherine Mansfield, who never wrote a novel.

These qualifications are trivial and cannot alter our opinion that in his completed work Dr Baker has made not only an interesting but an indispensable contribution to our knowledge of the English novel.

PELHAM EDGAR

*University of Toronto*

*George Meredith and His German Critics* By GUY B. PETTER.

With a preface by ERNEST A. BAKER London H. F. and G. Witherby, 1939 Pp 319 10/6

Here is an introduction to Meredith and a critical appraisal of his work which merits attention at this late day by reason of a new, profitable and indirect approach. The bulk of the book is occupied by a summarizing of German criticism, and the author most effectively justifies this in the opening paragraph of his conclusion. He writes "The fact that German critics only began to read Meredith in the twentieth century gives them an advantage over his contemporaries, who were, perhaps, too close to their subject, moreover the world in which we live today is so different from Meredith's world that it is possible to form an estimate of what has been lost or won by the changes, and to consider how far he was a herald of things to come. German critics were able to study the works of English, French and American reviewers and so form riper judgments."

Meredith's acquaintance with German life and letters of his own day is evident in much of his work, and those parts of Germany which were best known to him throughout his school days furnished many important scenes in his novels. So it is especially strange that German readers and critics of his own time, with their eagerness even then to discover Germanic influences beyond their own borders, should not have discovered him at all. But since 1910, writes Mr. Petter, "an important and original body of criticism has grown up in Germany, dealing sometimes with aspects of Meredith's genius which have not received sufficient recognition from English and French writers."

The arrangement of the book is at first confusing, since the author and compiler-translator introduces at once without comment his excellent translations of critical essays by German critics, and other brief German writings too didactic in style to be termed essays. These translations form the bulk of the volume, with chief space and importance accorded Greta Gümsehl's "The Relation of the Sexes in the Novels of George Meredith," included almost in its entirety. At intervals throughout the book Dr. Petter introduces at a tangent chapters of his own, as for instance his critical appraisal of Jean Paul Richter. The comparison of Jean Paul to Meredith, spiritually and intellectually, justifies its inclusion.

Whether or not we accept all of the judgments of German critics, it is obvious that there is great value to be gained from acquaintance with this fresh outside viewpoint, especially in such considerations as "George Meredith and the Marriage Problem" by Marie Moll, "Meredith's Women Characters" by Bierig, and "Goethe's Influence on George Meredith" by Maria Krusemeyer. That the modern German, looking back to the writings of Meredith, can find there



interpretations of an intellectual today and prophecies of tomorrow, is of value in itself

The author's own discussion of Meredith in relation to the scientific movement of his time would justify a separate brochure

BURGES JOHNSON

*Union College*

---

*Jean Racine* By A. F. B. CLARK Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1939 Pp. xiv + 354 pp. \$3 50 (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, xvi)

This book should be welcomed by lovers of Racine, not for its novelty, but because it gives to English and American readers a sympathetic treatment of the dramatist's productions. Much is said about the times in which he lived, and the connections between his life and his plays are carefully indicated. He is presented as unique in his "combination of passionateness of content with discipline of form" (p. 288). *Andromaque* seems to be Mr. Clark's favorite among Racine's plays, Phèdre among his characters. For the benefit of those who have too little French to understand the original, he has added 35 pages of translations, made by himself and others, into English unrimed pentameters. He states that his book "makes no claim to present new biographical discoveries or novel critical views. It is simply the product of a long acquaintance with Racine and a deep admiration for his art" (p. x).

Such admiration at times leads Mr. C. to defend the artist's character more warmly than the facts allow. On p. 116 he asserts that R. "had a perfect right to transfer" *Alexandre* to the other theater, "if he thought it was being given an inadequate presentation at the Palais Royal." He did not, however, "transfer" it, for Molière's troupe continued to play it. We know nothing about the manner in which these actors interpreted it. It was a well established custom that an author should not behave as R. did. If he had had a right to give a copy of his MS. to the rival actors, he would not have shocked La Grange, as he obviously did, nor would he have been deprived by Molière of his royalties. C. is less sure that R. was converted in 1677, but he claims that "a spiritual revulsion had set to work in him even before 1675" (p. 227), that he ceased to attend the theater, and that he "broke off relations with all his actor friends" (p. 223). To support the first assertion C. notes that R. obtained in 1675 permission to publish his translations of church hymns, but Mesnard held that the latter were written in R.'s youth, though he doubtless polished them before he published them. As C. offers no evidence against this theory, it is quite as reasonable to suppose that R. was moved by a successful

author's pride in his *juvénilla*. As for the other points, La Grange tells us in 1680 that R. had assigned the rôles in his plays to the actors of the newly formed Comédie Française, La Grange-Chancel reports that R. gave him lessons in dramatic composition as late as 1690-4 and attended in the last of these years a performance of his *Adherbal*, and even Louis Racine, momentarily forgetting his effort to beatify his father, refers to his presence at the performance of a play by the Italian troupe, certainly not proper company for a penitent. As a matter of fact, almost all the contemporary evidence indicates that R. gave up the theater because of his appointment as royal historiographer and that there was no genuine conversion before the last few years of his life. Poor Boyer, whom he hounded long, would be surprised to learn that so many modern scholars have accepted the filial legend.

A few details. p. 68, there is no seventeenth century evidence that R. ever employed the title, *Amours d'Ovide*, p. 168, Titus has a more definite struggle than C. allows (cf. Gonzague Truc), p. 180, Atalide is not murdered, but commits suicide, p. 151, to say that R. shows greater technical dexterity in the verses of *les Plaideurs* than Molière does in his comedies is to forget *Amphitryon*, p. 268, to assert that "Joas is the only real child in the whole literature of the age" is to ignore *le Malade imaginaire* and plays by Baron and Dancourt, p. 51, C's sweeping condemnation of Corneille's later plays, of Thomas Corneille, and of Quinault should be modified, and the evidence he offers of Quinault's originality is not well chosen, since Thomas Corneille dramatized a portion of a contemporary romance before Quinault did, p. 192, late 1674 is a better date for the first Parisian performance of *Iphigène* than early 1675, p. 295, 1677, the date given by J.-B. Racine for his father's sketch of *Iphigène en Tauride*, is preferable to 1673, selected by Mesnard because he accepted the hypothesis of R's conversion, p. 94, Champmeslé was married in 1665, not in 1669, p. 96, he was far too important a member of the troupe to justify C's suggestion that his place was kept for him by R's influence.

The book is pleasantly written and well printed. If Mr. Clark had not been anxious to celebrate Racine's tercentenary on the dot—his book appeared last December—he would have had more time for revision and might have avoided some of the statements that appear to me to be erroneous.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

*Antoine de Montchrestien, Aman, a Critical Edition.* By G. O. SEIVER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939. Pp. x + 163.

*Aman* was published in 1601, 1603, 1604, 1606, and 1627. Mr. Seiver shows that 1603 and 1627 are little more than reprints of 1601, 1606, of 1604. He reproduces on opposite pages the texts of 1601 and 1604. The latter was republished by Petit de Julleville in 1891, but the former had not been reproduced since the seventeenth century. Variants from 1627 and 1606 are grouped at the end. Material that could have been more easily found if it had

been presented in foot-notes is placed in the introduction, which is chiefly devoted to a comparison of the two editions and a study of the sources and methods employed in the composition of the tragedy. A linguistic chapter that S has prepared is reserved until all of M's plays can be similarly examined. In the meantime S states that he finds in *Aman* no evidence of Malherbe's influence, which M Lebègue had suspected. He very properly opposes Lanson's suggestion that the tragedy is a protest against Saint Bartholomew's.

S points out in detail M's debt to the Vulgate and to Robert Garnier's plays. He is inclined to believe that his author was acquainted with the *Targum Sheni*, perhaps "through some Hebrew scholar or rabbi" (p 45). The only resemblance that appears at all significant is the fact that in both the *Targum* and *Aman* the Jews are freed by Ahasuerus from the obligation to pay taxes. It would not, however, have been difficult for M to invent this detail after reading Esther, Chap X. Much more startling is S's suggestion that M, introduced, under Jewish influence, the theme of menstruation into his tragedy. This strikes me as preposterous. There is no reference to the subject in the passage quoted (p 46) from the *Targum*, for the sin to which Esther refers is that of cohabitation with a Gentile. Nor is there in the lines of *Aman* (1601). The hypothesis seems based on a verse of *Aman* (1604), "Luy deffend en ses iours la Royale presence," but *ses* must be a misprint for *ces*, a common type of error. Note that the phrase is substituted for *maintenant* of the earlier edition. Petit de Julleville gives *ces*. Both he and S. correct *se* to *ce* in verse 1464 of this same text. As Petit de Julleville calls attention to the latter correction, but says nothing about changing *ses* to *ces*, it is probable that *ces iours* was in the copy of *Aman* (1604) that he reproduced. S's extraordinary theory, one that ignores M's ideas of decorum, is based on a misprint in a copy that he examined, one that may not be found in other copies of the same edition. Before he published his book, I wrote S. that his theory was untenable, but, if I may paraphrase Haman's words, he has not "Daigné tant seulement l'oreille me prester."

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

---

*El Criticón*, por BALTASAR GRACIÁN, edición crítica y comentada por M. ROMERA-NAVARRO. Tomo Segundo. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, published in co-operation with the MLA., 1939. Pp 383. Tomo Tercero. *Ibid.*, 1940. Pp viii + 507.

The first volume of this masterly edition was reviewed in these pages, LIV (1939), 374-376. Volumes II and III complete the work, and preserve the same high standard. The text is printed with the

utmost care, and the copious footnotes reveal extraordinary learning. The editor seems to have read every author, Latin, Spanish, Italian, French or other, who can elucidate a phrase. He shows especial ingenuity in deciphering the many cryptic allusions to historical characters. The annotations are even so full as to distract at times, but Sr. Romera-Navarro can be forgiven, when his remarks are so illuminating. The following few corrections are offered:

II, 138, n 103, for Cáncer read Cancer, Foulche Delbosc's admonition (*Rev. Hisp.* LXXIII, 1928, 523-524) still goes unnoticed. II, 236, n 89, add G. G. King, *The Way of St. James*, N. Y.-London, 1920. II, 268, n 135, on Narváez add *El Buscón*, cap. VIII. II, 313, n 107: this note seems based on a misconception, the audience is laughing not because silence is called good, but because Virtelia finds good silence rare. III, 219, n 53, the correct derivation of *oro* [de] *tibar* was given by Engelmann as long ago as 1861, see Dozy Engelmann, *Glossaire*, p. 350.

At the end of Volume III are a *Registro de nombres*, an *Índice de palabras, frases y materiales*, and a *Registro de refranes y dichos proverbiales*. Carefully made, covering both text and notes, these add greatly to the usefulness of the edition, and will prove indispensable reference lists for students of language, customs, history, syntax and *refranes*. The last *Registro* does not wholly elude the difficulties inherent in alphabetizing proverbs, but it does as well as may be. The lists are remarkably complete. I have noted no omissions except *teñirse las canas* (II, 179 and n 79) and *sobriedad española* (II, 273, n 162), from the *Índice*.

As this reviewer rereads to the end the adventures of Critilo and Andrenio, he balks more than he used to over the intense artificiality of expression. The puns come to seem childish, the wilful balance cloy. Even the editor, whole-hearted admirer that he is, can complain (III, 88, n 43) at "tantos dichos sutiles que provocan primero la impaciencia del lector, obligándole a buscar un sentido razonable, y luego su disgusto al hallar tan trivial el misterio." But the keen observation, the shrewd and genial satire of life compensate for any failings. *El Criticón* is a classic, if a contorted one. It is safe to say that no other critical edition of it will be needed "de aquí a dozentos años." Next, some geographically-minded reader should work out a plan of the country traversed by the two heroes. If a *Carte de tendre*, why not a *Mapa del concepto*?

S. GRISWOLD MORLEY

*The University of California*

---

*Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature.* Presented to Professor Mildred K. Pope by Pupils, Colleagues and Friends. Manchester University Press, 1939. Pp. xiv + 429.

The international reputation of most of the contributors to this volume, the authoritative value of their offerings and the range of

the materials they have presented make the book worthy of its high purpose, namely to honour a remarkable teacher and a most distinguished scholar. Surely few *Festschriften* in its field have equalled the variety and richness of its contents. The value of the work is further enhanced by a portrait of Miss Pope, a biographical note and a list of her writings.

There are eight literary studies. E. J. Arnould, *Les Sources de Femina Nova*, H. B. Charlton, *France as Chaperone of Romeo and Juliet*, E. A. Francis, *The Trial in Lanval*, E. Hoepffner, *Le Roman d'Ille et Galeron et le lai d'Ehduc*, A. Jeanroy, *Les Genres lyriques secondaires dans la poésie provençale du xiv<sup>e</sup> siècle*, F. Whitehead, *Tristan and Isolt in the Forest of Morrois*, M. Williams, "Kerrins, li viauz rois de Riel" (*Erec*, l 1985). M. Wilmotte, *Reminiscences Ovidiennes dans le conte de Guillaume d'Angleterre*.

Six contributors investigate texts and manuscripts. G. E. Brereton, *Some Grammatical Changes made by two Continental Revisers of the Anglo-Norman prose version of Des Grantz Geanz*, K. Chesney, *A Fifteenth-century Miscellany (Notes on MS Douce 252)*, A. Ewert, *On the Text of Beroul's Tristan*, J. A. Noonan, *An Anglo-Norman Version of the Pseudo-Turpin*, E. Vinaver, *Principles of Textual Emendation*, M. Watkin, *Albert Stimming's Welsche Fassung in the Anglonormannische Boeve de Haumtone*.

Syntactical studies are L. Foulet, "Tous les combien passe-t-il?", D. R. Sutherland, *On the Use of Tenses in Old and Middle French*, T. B. W. Reid, *Non, nen, and ne with finite verbs in French*, F. J. Tanqueray, *Et particule*, T. B. L. Webster, *The Architecture of Sentences*. In the fields of phonetics and semantics we find J. P. Collas, *A Note on Final Consonants in the Poitevin Area*, R. C. Johnston, *How close O tonic and free became O*, J. Jud, *Observations sur le lexique de la Franche-Comté et du franco-provençal*, J. Orr, *On Homonymies*; D. A. Paton, *On the Origin of Aller*, R. L. G. Ritchie, *Early Instances of French Loan-words in Scots and English*.

Historians offer A. J. Carlyle, *The Survival of the Constitutional Traditions of Mediaeval France in the Seventeenth Century*, E. F. Jacob, *To and from the Court of Rome in the early Fifteenth Century*, E. Jamison, *Some Notes on the Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, with special reference to the Norman contingent from South Italy and Sicily in the first crusade, M. D. Legge, *William of Kingsmill, a Fifteenth-century Teacher of French in Oxford*.

There are two editions of short texts and two commentaries on passages in the *Chanson de Roland*. L. Brandin, *Le Dit des trois signes*, G. Hutchings, *Les Narbonnais* (Fragments of an assonanced version), R. Fawtier, *Notes pour le commentaire des vers 1877-1881 et 485-487 de la Chanson de Roland*, M. Roques, *Entre les dous furcelles (Roland, vv. 1294 et 2249)*. A paleographical

study and a contribution to the history of art complete the list  
 R J Dean, *An Essay in Anglo-Norman Palaeography*, R H  
 Wilenski, *A Mesopotamian Motif in Romanesque Sculpture*

G. F

## BRIEF MENTION

*Elizabeth Lloyd and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters* Edited by THOMAS FRANKLIN CURRIER Cambridge, Massachusetts Harvard University Press, 1939 Pp xiii + 146 \$3 00 Perhaps more legends cluster around Whittier than about any other American poet of the first half of the nineteenth century Mr Currier's recent Bibliography and a few articles by other scholars have now created a solid basis for criticism, and this sound little volume prepares the way still further for the definitive biography which is so grievously needed In a sense, this new contribution of Mr. Currier's is primarily an enrichment of background, for a number of the letters were not written by Whittier Their contents concern him less directly than the circle of the Lloyds, in which the poet moved in 1838, 1839, and 1840, in Philadelphia, where he had come to be editor of the abolitionist periodical, *The Pennsylvania Freeman* They are alive with friendly gossip of persons, parties, and high projects, described often in the gracious Quaker idiom.

Yet two episodes of Whittier's life emerge to aid the hypothetical biographer, who e'er he be! One is the clear definition, at one period in their history, of the relations of Elizabeth Lloyd with Whittier, a friendship blurred in a modern biography "A careful reading," says the editor, "of the letters here printed and of other documents has not given any reason to believe that they had, at this time, any serious thoughts of becoming engaged." The other fact is the serious meditation of Whittier on the possibility of a long poem which would express with emotional completeness the noble theme of the Quaker's view of slavery There are mutual exhortations between Elizabeth and Greenleaf, but neither bent to the task, and we must still lament the dispersal of Whittier's talents in hundreds of ephemeral verses on the same subject One thinks of his success in *Snowbound* as the sustained recording of his memories of New England rural life, but perhaps the unleashed feelings in the proposed humanitarian poem could never have been tempered by *Snowbound's* emotion recollected in tranquillity The letters are skilfully edited.

STANLEY T WILLIAMS

Yale University

*The Journal of David Garrick Describing his visit to France and Italy in 1763* Now first printed from the Original Manuscript in the Folger Shakespeare Library and edited with an Introduction & Notes by GEORGE WINCHESTER STONE, JR. New York The Modern Language Association of America (Revolving Fund Series, x), 1939 Pp xvi + 73 On his two journeys to the Continent Garrick started to keep records of his experiences and impressions On neither did he follow out his plan, but on both he jotted down memoranda in an interesting and charming fashion Those of his first trip to Paris (1751) were published in 1928 Now the journal of his grand tour has appeared It contains brief observations upon his trip from Calais to Milan, ending with his arrival at Genoa, where he first saw the Mediterranean and recorded, "what ever I think of it shall be wrote down when I have examin'd it" One is not certain whether this refers to the city or the sea, but the caution is characteristic of the author The latter parts of the notebook contain records of Garrick's purchases of books in Italy In the appendix, among other illuminating bits, the editor has printed, completely for the first time, the epitaph that Garrick wrote for himself during his illness at Munich, and a letter to his brother George. As here edited by Mr. Stone, these notes make a contribution to Garrick's biography and to travel literature, and assume more importance than their brevity would lead one to expect They constitute the companion piece to the earlier diary, they supplement the interesting letters written during the same trip (many, to George Garrick and the Duke of Devonshire for instance, still unpublished), and in a way they epitomize one of the most interesting Englishmen of the eighteenth century

DOUGALD MACMILLAN

*The University of North Carolina*

---

*Kipling's Reading and its Influence on his Poetry* By ANN M WEYGANDT Philadelphia University of Pennsylvania Press, 1939 Pp xiii + 200 \$2.00 This study deals with Kipling's readings in only English and American literature Sources of information are Kipling's artistic works, his autobiography and lectures, some thirty letters, his sister's and his two schoolmates' recollections, his father's book on India, and a few printed interviews By excellent use of those materials, Miss Weygandt traces Kipling's acquaintance with some 250 English and 30 American authors The result is a valuable index to his reading tastes He ranged from Old English "The Ruin" to Victorian Gilbert and American Harte. He was most at home in the Tudor-Stuart and the Victorian periods, showed least familiarity with the Fifteenth Century, remained generally silent concerning his late contemporaries Though little attracted by essays or post-Renaissance dramas, he

read widely in novels. But his references to poetry outnumber those to all prose types together.

Kipling's poetry was indebted to many predecessors. Notwithstanding his great admiration for poems by Coleridge and Keats, "his work shows almost no sign of having been influenced by Romantic poets or prose masters" (p. 73). But it was steeped in Shakespeare and the Renaissance Bible. He took quotations from Longfellow to set in his own pieces, used phrases from Tennyson as "a kind of second vocabulary" (p. 110), and echoed the forms of such different models as popular song, Herrick, Browning, and Swinburne. The study is excellent in its tracing of allusions, stanzaic patterns, meters, and phrasal resemblances. But it gives only occasional and inadequate attention to the thought-influences upon Kipling's poetry.

HILL SHINE

Maryville College

---

*Letters to Emma Lazarus in the Columbia University Library*  
 Edited by RALPH L. RUSK. New York: Columbia University Press, 1939. Pp. ix + 84. This slim book contains seventy-nine letters from twenty-four correspondents of Emma Lazarus, written between 1868 and 1885. The communications range from lengthy and intimate screeds by Emerson (who is represented by twenty-four letters) to brief notes arranging for an introductory meeting, such as that from Robert Browning. Other important correspondents are Tourguéneff, John Bourroughs, Henry George, Edmund Gosse, William Morris, and J. R. Lowell. The editorial apparatus is restricted to brief head-notes introducing each series of letters, and a satisfactory index. The texts retain the original spelling and punctuation without any "interpolated apologies." Students of Emma Lazarus or her period will find interesting support for Professor Rusk's contention that the letters are a "reflection of her literary enthusiasms, her ardor as a propagandist, and her character as a citizen of a larger world." The general reader will perhaps enjoy most the charmingly courteous letters of Emerson and a spirited defence of Carlyle by John Burroughs.

FREDERICK HARD

Newcomb College,  
 Tulane University

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

---

Is *Gautier d'Aupais* A TYPICAL "POÈME COURTOIS"? The main arguments of E. Fenimore, *MLN*, LV (1940), 338, had been anticipated in *PMLA*, LIV (1939), 632 §§ 2-3, 634 n. 12, 636 § 2, and in 13th century *Gautier*.



*d'Aupais* His analogies for *low* and *retor* appear in the 15th and 14th, mine started in the 12th and 13th. He considers Dupire's source, *Roy Modus*, II 351, irrelevant, so he unwittingly fuses *low* with *loue* "loutre." That doublet has been attested exclusively for *lucum*. Mr. F. quotes Dupire's examples (skipping the first). *Lourre* denotes "leurre." The historical background for 304 is an arrest and execution, cf. *La Curie de Sainte Palaye* *loure*, "tromperie." The other passages recall immediately *loure*, "prudence," in Molinet's *Mystere Saint Quentin* 9293. Mr. F. describes "leures," not the semantic evolution from "leurre" of birds to "condition" of people, yet he questions the established affinity *low logie*. Against monetary *retor* traced through five literary parallels and six dictionaries, he pits Froissart (see *PMLA*, notes 14, 18). For *Fraisne* 275, Warnke's definition seems preferable. The gravamen is the accumulative effect of monetary expressions, *Gautier d'Aupais* 516 is not an isolated case. Mr. F. dismisses 182, 235 dogmatically, slights Faral for 252, 581, and ignores 37 of the remaining 40 monetary expressions in his *impartial study*. He refers to an incomplete list of cynegetic metaphors, yet only one can be foisted on *Gautier d'Aupais*. The stylistic touch equating *onor*, "fief" 526—"honor" 664, is minimized by synonyms in 662, 697, 724, 726, likewise, Faral assigned a monetary origin to *enerrer*, *paver la bee* (page 31).

Mr. F. presents Gautier's selfish departure in strophe vi as a romantic "self-imposed exile." Gautier is a precursor of Christian wooing Roxane, declaiming his passion in heart-rending verses—composed by a talented friend. The lovers converse only when he enters her chamber unexpectedly, and she invites him to sit down on the bed beside her. The poet misses no opportunity to differentiate financially between Gautier and his many brothers and sisters (82, 526, 627, 662, 697, 726), Mr. F. sees merely an index to Gautier's social rank. That the girl considers possible marriage is substantiated by 354, 505, and subsequent episodes. One might overlook the latitude taken in translating 690 but for the untenable assumption (contradicted in 227). The messenger was not sent merely to inquire about the condition of a watchman: the rich girl had already rejected many noble suitors (317), the messenger does obtain both social and economic data (628), and she did not believe Gautier (693). Mr. F. misunderstands the mother's impulse to have Gautier put out of the house: she suspects the young lovers of an impropriety, the daughter even takes an oath, which the mother repeats to the father. The deduction that the mother evinces no curiosity about Gautier's inheritance disregards completely lines 722-727. The *denouement* comes when the future father-in-law treats Gautier munificently, and proposes politely: "Ma fille vous donrai se la volez baillier mil mars d'oi vous donrai por vous miez aaisier."

Mr. F.'s intransigent acceptance of the label "poeme courtois" induced me to weigh all the evidence in the balance. He has conceded that my *PMLA* article "presents fully the linguistic and semantic problems posed by the word *low* or *loue*." Otherwise an interpretation might be a mere figment of subjectivity varying from reader to reader.

RAFAEL LEVY

University of Baltimore

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received]

Black, Frank G.—The epistolary novel in the late eighteenth century, a descriptive and bibliographical study *Eugene, Oregon* U of Oregon Press, 1940 Pp vi + 184 \$1 25 (U of Ore Monographs, Studies in Literature and Philology, 2)

Boas, George (ed) — Romanticism in America, papers contributed to a symposium held at the Baltimore Museum of Art *Baltimore* Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 202, and xv plates \$2 25

Boker, George Henry — *Glaucaus* and other plays Ed Scully Bradley *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 228 \$5 00 (America's Lost Plays, vol iii)

Boucault, Dion — *Forbidden Fruit* and other plays Ed Allardyce Nicoll and F T Cloak *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp x + 313 \$5 00 (America's Lost Plays, vol i)

Brown, Carleton — Essays and studies in honor of *New York* N Y U Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 336

Carlyle, Thomas — Journey to Germany, Autumn, 1858 Ed R A E. Brooks *New Haven, Conn* Yale U Press, 1940 Pp xxxviii + 222 \$2 75 (Vassar College Seventy-fifth Anniversary Publication)

Carter, Robert. — Letters, 1720-1727, the commercial interests of a Virginia gentleman Ed Louis B Wright *San Marino, Calif* Huntington Library, 1940 Pp xiv + 153 \$2 50.

Cheyne, Dr George — Letters to the Countess of Huntingdon Ed C F Mullett *San Marino, Calif* Huntington Library, 1940 Pp xxiv + 64 \$1 75

Coles, Blanche — Shakespeare studies, *Julius Caesar* *New York* Richard R Smith, 1940 Pp xiv + 281 \$2 50

Daniels, R Balfour — Some seventeenth-century worthies in a twentieth-century mirror *Chapel Hill, North Carolina* U of N C Press, 1940 Pp xii + 156 \$2 00

Dunlap, Wilham — *False Shame and Thirty Years*, two plays Ed O S Coad *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 106 (America's Lost Plays, vol ii)

Ewing, S Blaine — Burtonian melancholy in the plays of John Ford *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press 1940 Pp x + 122 \$1 50 (Princeton Studies in English, 19)

Fiske, Christabel F — Epic suggestion in the imagery of the Waverley novels *New*

*Haven, Conn* Yale U Press, 1940 Pp xxvi + 141 \$2 50 (Vassar College Seventy fifth Anniversary Publication)

Gilbert, Allan H — Literary criticism, Plato to Dryden *New York* American Book Co., 1940 Pp xii + 704 \$4 00

Graham, Philip and Jones, Joseph — A concordance to the poems of Sidney Lanier *Austin, Texas* U of Tex Press, 1939 Pp vi + 447 \$3 50

Grover, L, Murdock, F, Wallack, L, Jessop, G H, and McCloskey, J J — *Davy Crockett* and other plays Ed I Goldberg and H Heffner *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp xxvi + 231 \$5 00 (America's Lost Plays, vol iv)

Gummer, Ellis N — Dickens' works in Germany, 1837-1937 *Oxford* Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1940 Pp viii + 200 \$4 25 (Oxford Studies in Modern Languages and Literature)

Harris, Jesse W — John Bale, a study in the minor literature of the Reformation *Urbana, Ill* U of Ill Press, 1940 Pp 157 \$1 50 and \$2 00 (Ill Studies in Lang and Lit, XXV, 4)

Heningham, Eleanor Kellogg — An early Latin debate of the body and soul, preserved in MS Royal 7AIII in the British Museum *New York* Privately printed, 1939 Pp viii + 83 \$1 00 N Y U Diss

Hoare, Dorothy M — Some studies in the modern novel *Litchfield, Conn* Prospect Press, 1940 Pp vi + 154 \$2 00

Jespersen, Otto — The 'split infinitive' and a system of clauses *Oxford* Clarendon Press [New York Oxford U Press], 1940 Pp ii + 19 \$0 85 (S P E Tract, LIV)

Johnson, Thomas H — The printed writings of Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758, a bibliography *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 136 \$7 50

Kaplan, Estelle — Philosophy in the poetry of Edwin Arlington Robinson *New York* Columbia U Press, 1940 Pp xii + 162 \$2 25 (Columbia Studies in American Culture, 7)

Kennedy, Charles W — *Beowulf*, the oldest English epic, translated into alliterative verse, with a critical introduction *London* [New York] Oxford U Press, 1940 Pp lxvi + 121 \$1 65

Lindsay, Nicholas Vachel — Letters to A Joseph Armstrong Ed A Joseph Armstrong *Waco, Texas* Baylor U Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 121 (Baylor Bulletin, xliii, 3)

Lucas, F L — Ten Victorian poets *Cambridge* University Press [New York Macmillan], 1940 Pp xx + 199 \$2 50 [Second edition with two new chapters on Patmore and Christina Rossetti]

Lucken, Brother Linus U, F S C — Anti-

christ and the prophets of Antichrist in the Chester Cycle *Washington, D C* Catholic U of America Press, 1940 Pp x + 158 Diss

Marckwardt, Albert H and Walcott, Fred G—Facts about current English usage *New York* D Appleton-Century, 1938 Pp x + 144 \$0 90 (National Council of Teachers of English, English Monograph, 7)

Maynadiei, Gustavus Howard—The first American novelist? *Cambridge, Mass* Harvard U Press, 1940 Pp 79 \$1 25

Metzdorf, Robert F (compiler)—Catalogue of the autograph collection of the University of Rochester *Rochester, N Y* U of Roch Library, 1940 Pp 176

Myers, Edward D—The foundations of English *New York* Macmillan, 1940 Pp xxii + 301 \$3 00

Norton, William J, Jr—Bishop Butler, moralist and divine *New Brunswick, N J* Rutgers U Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 336 \$3 75 (Rutgers U Studies in Philos, 1)

Osgood, Charles G and Herrick, Marvin T—Eleven British writers, *Beowulf* to Arnold, and a selection of representative lyrics *Boston* Houghton Mifflin, 1940 Pp xiv + 1396 \$5 00

Oxford Book of Christian Verse—Ed Lord David Cecil *Oxford* Clarendon Press, 1940 Pp xxxiv + 560 \$3 00

Patterson, Frank A and Fogle, F R—An index to the Columbia edition of the works of John Milton *New York* Columbia U Press, 1940 Pp xxviii, xi + 2141 \$12 50

Payne, John H—*Trial Without Jury* and other plays Ed C Hislop and W R Richardson *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp xviii + 264 (America's Lost Plays, vol v)

Power, Julia—Shelley in America in the nineteenth century, his relation to American critical thought and his influence *Lincoln, Nebraska* U of Neb, 1940 Pp viii + 225 \$1 50 (U of Neb Studies, xl, 2)

Rainolds, John—*Oratio in laudem artis poeticae* [circa 1572] Ed W Ringler and W Allen, Jr *Princeton, N J* Princeton U Press, 1940 Pp viii + 93 \$1 50 (Princeton Studies in English, 20)

Read, William A—Studies for A miscellany presented by some of his colleagues and friends Ed Nathaniel M Caffee and Thomas A Kirby *University, Louisiana* La State U Press, 1940 Pp x + 338 \$4 50

Revue française des idées et des œuvres—*Paris* Editions Corrèa, May, 1940 Pp iv + 79 9 fr [Contains Charles Morgan, "Emily Bronte"]

Rix, Herbert D.—Rhetoric in Spenser's poetry *State College, Pa* Pa State College, 1940. Pp 88 (Pa State College Studies, 7.)

Rossetti, Dante Gabriel—Letters to Fanny Cornforth Ed Paull F Baum *Baltimore, Md* Johns Hopkins Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 142 \$2 25

Sharp, Robert L—From Donne to Dryden, the revolt against metaphysical poetry *Chapel Hill, N C* U of N C Press, 1940 Pp xiv + 221 \$3 00

Smith, Marion B—Marlowe's imagery and the Marlowe canon Diss *Philadelphia, Pa* U of Pa Press, 1940 Pp viii + 213

Stern, Bernard H—The rise of romantic hellenism in English literature, 1732 1786 *Menasha, Wisc* George Banta Co, 1940 Pp x + 182 \$2 25

Thorpe, Clarence DeW—The aesthetic theory of Thomas Hobbes, with special reference to his contribution to the psychological approach in English literary criticism *Ann Arbor, Mich* U of Mich Press, 1940 Pp x + 339 \$4 00 (U of Mich Pubs, Lang and Lit, xviii)

Tinker, C B and Lowry, H F—The poetry of Matthew Arnold, a commentary *New York* Oxford U Press, 1940 Pp xvi + 404 \$3 50

Wood, Frederick T—Training in thought and expression *London* [New York] Macmillan, 1940 Pp viii + 208 \$0 75

Worcester, David—The art of satire *Cambridge, Mass* Harvard U Press, 1940 Pp x + 191 \$1 75

Wordsworth, William—The white doe of Rylstone Critically ed by Alice P Comparetti *Ithaca, N Y* Cornell U Press, 1940 Pp. xii + 311 \$2 50 (Cornell Studies in English, xix)

Yeats, William B—Letters on poetry to Dorothy Wellesley *New York* Oxford U Press, 1940 Pp viii + 216 \$2 50

## GERMAN

Andersen, Erna—Die Eingänge im deutschen Märchen Ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde der Volkserzählung Diss *Jena* Frankfurt a M Baum, 1939 93 pp

Bach, Rudolf—Der Aufbruch des deutschen Geistes Lessing, Klopstock, Herder *Mark kleeberg* Rauch [1939] 96 pp M 3 60

Berger, Kurt.—Die Balladen Schillers im Zusammenhang seiner lyrischen Dichtung [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte Bd 23] *Berlin* Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1939 84 pp M 3 70

Dormagen, Paul—Die epischen Elemente in Adalbert Stifters "Witiko" Diss *Bonn* Würzburg Triltsch, 1940 98 pp M 2 70

Erbeing, Elisabeth—Frauengestalten in der "Octavia" des Anton Ulrich von Braunschweig Diss *Münster* [Germanische Studien, H 218]. *Berlin* Ebering, 1939 133 pp M 5 40

Field, Jean Clark—Das Wunderbare bei Ludwig Tieck Diss *Zurich* Lang, 1939 120 pp

Flemming, Herbert—Johann Gottfried v Herder und die Deutung des Lebens Grundlagen der Bildungswirklichkeit Diss Heidelberg [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgeschichte Bd 22] *Berlin* Junker u Dunnhaupt, 1939 60 pp M 2 60

Fricker, Karl—Wilhelm Raabes Stuttgarter Jahre im Spiegel seiner Dichtung Mit 37 Abb [Veröffentlichungen d. Archivs d Stadt Stuttgart H 6] *Stuttgart* F Kraus, 1939 160 pp M 3 50

Goethe-Kalender Hrsg vom Frankfurter Goethe Museum (Jg 33) 1940 *Leipzig* Dietrich [1939] 356 pp M 4 50

Grimmelshausen—Continuatio des abentheuerlichen Simplicissimi (oder der Schluss desselben) Hrsg von J H Scholte [Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d 16 u 17 Jhs Nr 310-314] *Halle*. Niemeyer, 1939 lxx, 125 pp M. 4 50

Kerstholt, Ludgera Maria—Das Bild der Welt in Brentanos Romanzen vom Rosenkranz Diss Munster [Germanische Studien, H 211] *Berlin*: Ebering, 1939 92 pp. M 3 90

Kommerell, Max—Lessing und Aristoteles Untersuchungen über die Theorie der Tragodie [Frankfurter wiss Beiträge Kulturwiss Reihe Bd 2] *Frankfurt a M* Klostermann [1940] 315 pp M 10

Mulot, Arno—Das Reich in der deutschen Dichtung unserer Zeit [= Mulot, Die deutsche Dichtung unserer Zeit T 2, Buch 1] *Stuttgart*. Metzler, 1940 vii, 96 pp. M 3 40

Pesta, Hans—Der Bildungsgehalt der Dichtung von Friedrich Hebbel Eine bildungswissenschaftliche Untersuchung Diss [Erziehungswiss Studien. H. 9] *Hamburg* Riegel, 1938 78 pp M 3

Schinnerer, Otto P—Reading German *New York*. Macmillan, 1940 vi, 154 pp \$1 25

Schmeller, J. Andreas—Bayerisches Wörterbuch Unveränderter Nachdruck der 2 unter Berücksichtigung der vom Verfasser hinterlassenen Nachträge von G Karl Frommann bearb Ausgabe München 1872-77. Mit einem Vorwort und einer wissenschaftlichen Einleitung von Prof Dr O Mausser 2 Bde *Leipzig*. K F. Koehler, 1939 61, xv pp., 1784 cols; xv, 1264 cols. 4° M 45

Schmidt, Adalbert—Helferich Peter Sturz Ein Kapitel aus der Schrifttumsgesch zwischen Aufklärung und Sturm und Drang Hab-Schrift Wien *Reichenberg*. Fr Kraus, 1939 86 pp

Schmidt-Paul, Ehsabeth von.—Rainer

Maria Rilke Ein Gedenkbuch *Basel* Schwabe [1940] 276 pp M 4 80

Sorgatz, Heimfried—Musiker und Musikanten als dichterisches Motiv Eine Studie zur Auffassung und Gestaltung des Musikers in der erzählenden Dichtung vom Sturm und Drang bis zum Realismus Diss *Märburg* [Literarhistorisch-musikwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen Bd 6] *Würzburg* Triltsch, 1939 xv, 133 pp 4° M 6

Storm, Theodor—Theodor Storm und Karl Theodor Pyl Unbekannte Briefe, hrsg von Kurt Gassen *Greifswald* [1939] 26 pp

Tinnefeld, Maria—Wilhelm Raabes Menschengestaltung Diss *Münster* [Neue deutsche Forschungen Abt Neuere deutsche Literaturgesch Bd 24] *Berlin*: Junker u Dunnhaupt [1939] 118 pp M 5 50

Vries, Jan de—Het korte Sigurdlied [Mededeelingen d kkl Nederlandsche Akad van Wetenschappen, Afd Letterkunde, N R, Deel 2, No 11] *Amsterdam* N V Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij [1939] Fl 120

Weber, Hanna—Herders Sprachphilosophie Eine Interpretation in Hinblick auf die moderne Sprachphilosophie Diss *Bonn* [Germanische Studien H 214] *Berlin*. Ebering, 1939 98 pp M 4

Zierau, Gerhard—Zum Triumf des grossen Lebens Stefan George Der Teppich des Lebens und die Lieder von Traum und Tod mit einem Vorspiel Eine Deutung Diss *Leipzig* *Dresden* Dittert, 1939 xiv, 210 pp

## FRENCH

Balzac.—Le Message, ed G B. Raser. *Cambridge* Harvard U Press, 1940 66 pp. \$1 00

Bond, O F—Contes Bk VIII *Boston*. Heath, 1940 60 pp

Bowman, R K—The Connections of the Geste des Loherains with other Fr Epics and Mediaeval Genres *New York* 1940

Chapman, Percy A—The Spirit of Molière, ed J-A Bède, introd C Gauss *Princeton*. Princeton U Press, 1940 xxii + 250 pp \$3 50

Du Bartas.—Works, vol III, ed U T. Holmes, J C Lyons, R W Linker *Chapel Hill* U of N C Press, 1940 x + 576 pp. \$5 00

French Renaissance Illustrative set no 3. Museum Extension Pubs *Boston* Museum of Fine Arts, 1940 42 plates

Graud, Jeanne—Manuel de bibliographie littéraire *Paris* Vrin, 1939 xxii + 304 pp.

Hazard, Paul.—Quatre Etudes (Baudelaire, Romantiques, Cycle poétique, l'Homme de sentiment) *New York* Oxford Press, 1940. x + 154 pp \$2 00

Hendrix, W S and W. E. Meiden—Beginning French, a cultural approach *Bos-*

ton Houghton Mifflin, 1940 xxiv + 408 pp \$2 00

Henry of Lancaster—Le Livre de Seyntz Medicines, unpub devotional treatise, ed E J Arnould *Oxford* Blackwell, 1940 xvi + 244 pp (Anglo-Norman Text Soc 2)

Koch, Sister Marie Pierre—An Analysis of the Long Prayers in O Fr Lit with special ref to the "Biblical-Creed-Narrative" prayers Diss *Washington* Catholic U, 1940 viii + 204 pp

La Rochefoucauld—Maxims, trans F G Stevens *London* H Milford [New York Oxford U Press], 1940 xlv + 196 pp \$0 80

Miller and Nielson.—Outlines and tests on Fr civilization *New York* Crofts, 1940 112 pp \$0 80

Moody, George — Anthologie de contes français *New York* Holt, 1940 viii + 256 + cxx pp \$1 50

Nitze, W A — Arthurian Romance and Modern Poetry *Chicago* U of Chicago Press, 1940 xii + 101 pp \$1 00

O'Brien, K L, LaFrance, M S, and Freeman, S A—Second-year French *Boston* Ginn, 1940 xxxii + 523 pp \$1 72

Renard, Maurice—La Vipère de Luvercy *Boston* Heath, 1940 x + 260 pp

Sahn, Margit — Etude sur la carole medievale Diss *Uppsala* Almqvist & Wiksells, 1940 xii + 243 pp

Savory, D L—Jean Racine, a public lecture *London* [New York]: Oxford U Press, 1940 31 pp \$0 40

Trahard, Pierre — Le Mystère poetique *Paris* Boivin, 1940 176 pp Fr 25

Zola—Letters to J Van Santen Kolff, ed R J Niess *St Louis* Washington U, 1940 xvi + 59 pp (Wash U Studies, Lang and Lit, 10)

### ITALIAN

Alighieri, Dante—Rime A cura di Gianfranco Contini *Torino* G Einaudi, 1939 241 pp L 15

Ariosto, L.—Le commedie, a cura di M Catalano *Bologna* Zanichelli, 1940 2a ediz. 2 voll lxiv + 814 pp L 80

Battisti, Carlo — I nomi locali delle valli di Badia e Marebbe Con quattro illustrazioni nel testo, una fuori testo e quattro cartine geografiche *Firenze* Rinascimento del libro, 1940 318 pp L 80

Benini, Rodolfo — Scienza, religione ed arte nell'astronomia di Dante *Roma*. R Accademia d'Italia, 1939

Berchet, Giovanni.—Lettera semiseria di Grisostomo e saggi d'altri scritti. A cura di N Caccia *Milano*. Signorelli, 1939.

Camerani, S — Bibliografia Medicea (Saggio) *Firenze*. Centro Naz di Studi sul Rinascimento, 1940 67 pp L 12.

Fumagalli, G. — Vocabolario bibliografico Opera postuma per cura di G Boffito e G De Bernard *Firenze* Olschki, 1940 viii + 450 pp L 180

Fusco, Maria — Vincenzo Gioberti critico letterario *Catania* Studio edit moderno, 1940 43 pp L 6

Leopardi, G.—Operette morali, con proemio e note di G Gentile 3 ediz riveduta *Bologna* Zanichelli, 1940 lxiv + 344 pp L 15

Lupi, Angela — Le "Osservazioni sulla morale cattolica" Studio sulla loro formazione dai manoscritti alle due edizioni *Genova* Albrighi, Segati e C, 1940 63 pp L 12

Stecchetti, Lorenzo.—Le Rime (Ristampa) *Bologna* Zanichelli, 1940 xiv + 630 pp L 25

Sticco, Maria — La poesia religiosa del Risorgimento *Milano* "Vita e pensiero," 1940 x + 584 pp L 35

Strinati, E. — Riepilogando (Spunti di critica) Vol I *Modena* Guanda, 1940 289 pp L 12

Tommaso da Ferrara — Trattato del modo di ben governare Opera inedita del sec XV a cura di A Acito *Milano* ediz della rivista "Tempo di Mussolini" s a

Trapani, Filippa — Gli antichi vocabolari siciliani *Palermo* R Deput di storia patria, Estratto dall' "Archivio storico per la Sicilia," vol VII 84 pp

### SPANISH

Avrett, Robert. — Sp Review Grammar *New York*. Harper, 1940 xiv + 266 pp

Galdós—Doña Perfecta, ed W F Byess and W E Stiefel *Boston* Heath, 1940 viii + 200 pp

Hurtado de Mendoza — Algunas cartas escritas 1538-52, publ Vazquez, A, y R S Rose *New Haven* Yale U Press, 1935 (June 7, 1940) xlv + 426 pp \$3 00

Kany, C. E.—Rounded Vowel e in the Sp Diphthong ue *Berkeley*. U of Cal Press, 1940 20 pp

López y Fuentes, G.—El Indio, ed E H Hespelt *New York* Norton, 1940 251 pp.

Peers, E A—A History of the Romantic Movement in Spain 2 vols *Cambridge* U Press [New York Macmillan], 1940 xxvi + 349, xii + 470 pp \$12 00

Pellegrini, Silvio — Repertorio bibliografico della prima lirica portoghese *Modena* Soc tip modenese, 1939 85 pp

Romera-Navarro, M.—Luces de España *Boston*. Heath, 1940 x + 303 pp

Van Horne, John.—Bernardo de Balbuena, biografía y crítica *Guadalajara, Mexico*: Font, 1940 185 pp

# Modern Language Notes

---

Volume LV

DECEMBER, 1940

Number 8

---

## LYDGATE'S *HORSE, SHEEP AND GOOSE* AND HUNTINGTON MS HM 144

Of Lydgate's shorter poems, the *Horse, Sheep and Goose* seems to have been one of the most popular in its own day. No fewer than a dozen manuscripts of this text as well as five editions printed in the fifteenth century are known to us. Although the poem has been critically edited a number of times,<sup>1</sup> the text preserved in the Huntington MS HM 144 was not consulted for these editions. A note on this text will not, I think, be found unwelcome.

The text in the Huntington manuscript occupies folios 140<sup>v</sup> to 144<sup>r</sup>, these lines correspond to stanzas 43 through 77 of MacCracken's edition. Following at the end of the poem, there are seven further stanzas in the same hand while a different, though contemporary, hand has added still another.

The merest glance at the variant readings shows that the text in the Huntington manuscript is closely related to that in the printed editions, every variant reading peculiar to the printed editions is also found in the Huntington text. Furthermore the seven stanzas on folio 144 are peculiar to the Huntington manuscript and the printed texts, no other manuscript containing these stanzas is known. If, then, the manuscript actually belongs to the decade (1460-70) assigned to it by F. J. Furnivall and Carleton Brown,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> F. J. Furnivall, *Political, Religious and Love Poems* (*EETS*, O S 15, pp 15-22, and revised edition, pp 15-42), M. Degenhart, *Munchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie* (Heft xix, Leipzig, 1900); H. N. MacCracken, *The Minor Poems of John Lydgate* (*EETS*, O S 192, pp 539-66). For the kind gift of a set of photostats and permission to quote from them, I am obliged to the authorities of the Henry E. Huntington Library.

<sup>2</sup> Furnivall, *Notes and Queries, Fifth Series*, ix 342, Brown, *A Register of Middle English Religious & Didactic Verse*, Oxford, 1916-20, i, 472.

it cannot, of course, be a copy of a book printed in 1477. It is equally apparent, though, that this was not the manuscript used by Caxton as it lacks the first 42 stanzas found in the printed text, this omission cannot be the result of a simple lacuna in the manuscript as the poem begins on the verso of a leaf, the recto of which contains the closing lines of Lydgate's *Churl and the Brd.* Under these circumstances the only possible explanation is that the Huntington manuscript was transcribed from the same one used by Caxton or from some "sister-manuscript" of this which also may have lacked the first 42 stanzas. There is, however, no textual evidence to show that the Huntington manuscript derives from any other source than Caxton or his original. In only twelve cases do the Huntington (H) and Caxton (C) texts differ, ten of which are of no importance whatsoever.<sup>3</sup> The only real differences occur in lines 521 and 533. In the first case, the two texts respectively read

And though one be more than another stronge (C)  
 And though one be weke and another stronge (H)

As no other manuscript has the reading of the Huntington text, it is probable that we are here dealing with nothing more than a scribal emendation. In line 533, the texts read

As thus all vertues allone hath not one man (C)  
 And thus all vertues allone hathe not one man (H)

Whether these variant readings indicate that the Huntington manuscript derives from a different source than the early printed editions may be seriously doubted. The variations are so slight that they can hardly be more than scribal errors and emendations.

On the other hand, if the dating of the manuscript is wrong and if it be supposed that it was actually written after 1477,<sup>4</sup> a further possibility presents itself, namely that the Huntington manuscript

<sup>3</sup> Line 331, comparison C *and* paryson H, l. 349, considere C *and* cosidere H, l. 380, His C *and* H<sub>1</sub> H, l. 399, that pees C *and* pees H, l. 413, thy C *and* the H, l. 434, defenden C *and* defend H, l. 454, spekes C *and* spokes H, l. 468, recoure C *and* recouer H, l. 478, in to C *and* in H, l. 504, hem at C *and* hem H. Although lines 426-7 were originally transposed, this was corrected by the scribe.

<sup>4</sup> I am obliged to the manuscript department of the Huntington Library for pointing out that Prof. Manly dated the MS, though without giving specific reasons, as 1480-1500 (*The Text of The Canterbury Tales*, I, 291). The present paper, therefore, helps to confirm Prof. Manly's dating.

was copied from a printed edition. Of the five fifteenth-century editions, those printed by Wynkyn de Worde may be eliminated at once, that the Huntington manuscript was not copied from these is clear since all three lack stanzas 67 through 77 which are included in the Huntington text.<sup>5</sup> The whole problem therefore resolves itself into the question was the Huntington manuscript copied from a Caxton edition and, if so, from which one? Three significant points seem to indicate that the manuscript was copied from the printed book. First of all, the text in the Huntington manuscript comprises the contents of the second quire in the Caxton edition, in short, it may be argued that the scribe transcribed his text from a copy that had lost the whole of the first quire. In the second place, the interlinear, rather than marginal, explanations are somewhat more characteristic of printed books than of manuscripts. Lastly, and perhaps the most significant of all, is the evidence afforded by a single line (537) Here the Caxton editions and the Huntington manuscript agree in the reading

Yf charyte gouerne well the rother

I think it is clear that a simple misprint ("rother" for "tother") in Caxton's first edition was mechanically copied both by the scribe of the Huntington manuscript and by the compositor who set the text of Caxton's second edition. As it is difficult to believe that the scribe could have independently made the same mistake and in view of the fact that the text wanting in the Huntington manuscript corresponds exactly to the contents of one quire in Caxton's editions, it seems likely that the Huntington manuscript derives from the printed edition rather than from Caxton's original.

It is probable, moreover, that the Huntington manuscript was copied from Caxton's first edition rather than from the second. The orthography in the manuscript compares more nearly to that in the first edition than to that in the second. Furthermore in the

<sup>5</sup> E. Gordon Duff (*The Printers, Stationers and Bookbinders of Westminster and London from 1476 to 1535*, Cambridge, 1906, p. 32) says "One of these reprints shows how careless a printer W. de Worde was. He reprints the *Horse, the Shepe, and the Ghoos*, from a copy of Caxton's wanting a leaf, but never noticing anything wrong prints straight ahead, making of course nonsense of the whole." As Caxton printed only six stanzas to a leaf and as eleven stanzas are wanting, it is clear that the Caxton copy used by de Worde lacked not one but *two* leaves, these leaves were the fifth and sixth of the second quire.



two instances where the editions differ textually, the manuscript agrees with the first edition in each case. In line 411, the manuscript and the first edition have "circumstaunce" while the second edition has the plural case, in line 455, the same two texts read "Torned" while the second edition has "Torneth"

As both Furnivall and Carleton Brown failed to realize that the additional stanzas were also included in the printed editions of the *Horse, Sheep and Goose*,<sup>6</sup> these are here reprinted from the manuscript with the variant readings taken from four of the printed editions

## I

Hit is ful harde to knowe ony estate  
 Double visage loketh oute of euery hood  
 Sewerte is loste Truste is past the date  
 Thrifte hathe take his leue ouer the flood  
 5 Lawe can do no thyng withouten good  
 Thefte hathe leue to goo oute at large  
 Of the communes mysreule hathe take the charge

## II

And thou desire thy self to auauunce  
 Poure or riche whether that thou be  
 10 Be lowly and gentyl in thy gouernaunce  
 Good reule douteles may best preferre the  
 Yf thou be gentyl hurte not thy degre  
 And thou be poure do alle that thou canne  
 To vse goode maners for maner maket[h] man

## III

15 Atte thy mele be glad in countenaunce  
 In mete and drynke be thou mesurable  
 Beware of surfete and mysgouernaunce

---

<sup>6</sup> The editions are the following Caxton's first (Duff 261 = 1), Caxton's second (Duff 262 = 2), de Worde's first (Duff 263 = 3), de Worde's second (Duff 264), de Worde's third (Duff 265 = 5) I have been unable to see the only known copy of de Worde's second edition, which is in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire It may here be pointed out that, though de Worde's first edition follows the Caxton prints very carefully, his third edition contains numerous alternative readings, mostly not very good ones We may also note that, in line 38 below, the Huntington MS and de Worde's third edition have the correct reading, while de Worde's first edition follows the misprints of the Caxton editions.

- They cause men ofte to be vnresonable  
 Suffre no thyng be sayde at thy table  
 20 That ony man may hurte or displese  
 For good mete and drynke axeth Joye and ese

IV

- Yf thy goodes to the not suffyse  
 Conforme the euer to that thou hast  
 Gouverne so thy self in suche a wyse  
 25 In thyn expences make no waste  
 Grete excesse causeth vnthrift in haste  
 Beware be tyme bere this in thyn herte  
 Misrewle maketh ofte many men to smerte

V

- Beware of nouellis that be new brought  
 30 Though they be plesaunt lokke fast thy lyppe  
 An hasty worde may be to sore bought  
 Close thy mouthe leste thy tounge trippe  
 To thy self loke thou make not a whyppe  
 Hurte not thy self lest thou sore rewe  
 35 For thyn owne ese keepe thy tonge in mewe

VI

- The worlde so wyde the ayre so remeuable  
 The sely man so lytel of stature  
 The graue and grounde of clothyng so mutable  
 The fyre so hoote and subtyll of nature  
 40 The water neuer in oon what creature  
 That made is of these foure thus flyttyng  
 Maye endure stable and perseuere in abydyng

VII

- The further I goo the more behynde  
 The more behynde the ner my weyes ende  
 45 The more I seche the werse can I fynde  
 The lyghter leue the lother for to wende  
 The truer I serue the ferther oute of mynde  
 Though I goo loose I am teyde wth a lyne  
 Is hit fortune or Infortune thus I fyne

Explicit

[Different hand]

## VIII

- 50 Wo worthe debate þat neuer may haue pease  
 Wo worthe penaunce þat askith no pyte  
 Wo worthe vengeaunce whiche mercy may not sease  
 Wo worthe þat Jugement þat hathe none equite  
 Wo worthe þat trouthe þat hathe no charite
- 55 Wo worthe þat Juge þat may no gilt[y] saue  
 Wo worthe þat right þat may no fauor haue

1 5 withouten] without 35, 1 14 maner] maners 5, 1 15 mele] mete 5  
 countenaunce] contenance 123, 1 16 dryke (*sic*) 3, 1 19 be] to be 5 thy]  
 the 5, 1 21 good] god *corrected to* good MS axeth] asketh 5, 1 22 goodes]  
 goddes 5, 1 23 Conforme] Conferme 5, 1 28 ofte] *omitted* 5 smerte]  
 smarte 3, sterte 5, 1 30 lokke] loke 2, 1 34 Hurte] Hute *corrected to*  
 Hurte MS, 1 36 remeuable] remuable 1235, 1 38 grounde of clothyng]  
 gound of clotyng 123, 1 39 suptyll (*sic*) 5, 1 41 fletyng 5, 1 48 louse  
 35, 1 49 fyne] fynde *corrected to* fyne MS, 1 55 gilt MS

As the present writer has previously pointed out,<sup>7</sup> the last stanza (which is not included in the printed editions and which is probably written in a different hand) may also be found in the *Court of Sapience* (stanza 67) and in Ashby's *Active Policy of a Prince* (stanza 99). Although the first five stanzas are very Lydgatian in character, a reasonably careful search has failed to identify them. The remaining two stanzas, as Furnivall and Degenhart have already pointed out, are sometimes called "Halsham's Ballad." These lines have a rather amazing "history" behind them. The first of these stanzas occurs in Lydgate's *A Pageant of Knowledge*, of which both a seven and an eight line version are known to us.<sup>8</sup> The second forms part of another of Lydgate's poems, being the first stanza of his *Tyed with a Lyne*.<sup>9</sup> It may also be found as a single stanza in British Museum MS Addit 5465, f. 2<sup>v</sup>, while the first also occurs alone in MS Addit 34360, f. 22<sup>r</sup>. The two are found together as "Halsham's Ballad" (Brown 2252)<sup>10</sup> in MS. Harley 7333, f. 148<sup>r</sup>, and in MS Addit 16165, f. 244<sup>r</sup>. Combined with Lydgate's *Stanza on Decent* (Brown 438) and his *Four Things that make a Man a Fool* (Brown 2693), it appears in Bodleian MS. Fairfax 16, f. 195<sup>r</sup>, while in MS. Harley 7578, f. 20<sup>r</sup>, these same four stanzas reappear but with Chaucer's *Proverb* (Brown 2510)

<sup>7</sup> *The Sources of the Court of Sapience*, Leipzig, 1932, p. 87

<sup>8</sup> MacCracken, *op cit*, p. 730 and p. 734

<sup>9</sup> MacCracken, *op cit*, p. 832

<sup>10</sup> The references are to Carleton Brown's *Register etc.*, II

inserted in the middle. The appearance of the Halsham Ballad in these additional stanzas is merely another example of the extraordinary adaptability of Lydgate's stanzas,<sup>11</sup> they could be combined in any number of ways to form a tolerable poem.<sup>12</sup>

CURT F. BUHLER

*The Pierpont Morgan Library*

---

<sup>11</sup> The *Stanza on Decent* comes from Lydgate's *Fall of Princes*, compare Brown 438. For other extracts from the *Fall of Princes*, see my paper "A New Lydgate-Chaucer Manuscript," *MLN*, Jan, 1937, p. 2. At least two other versions of *Four Things that make a Man a Fool* are known (Brown 2271 and 2272). *Four Things* and *Decent* are combined to form a single poem in MS 775 of The Pierpont Morgan Library (f. 320r), though this was not known to Brown or MacCracken. *Four Things* is furthermore added to some stanzas extracted from another poem (Brown 2081) in MS Harley 2251, f. 150v, while in MS R. 3. 19 (f. 205v) of Trinity College, Cambridge, it forms the second stanza of a poem beginning "O mosy quince hangyng by your stalke" (compare Speght's *Chaucer*, f. 344v). It may finally be noted that *Decent* occurs attached to a stanza on the uncertainties of this world (Brown 2509) in MS Douce 45, ff. 115v-116r.

<sup>12</sup> As I have rejected Helen P. South's contention that Halsham was the real author of the Ballad ("The Question of Halsam," *PMLA*, L, 362-71), it has been suggested to me that my reasons for this should be made clear. Dr. South based her belief mainly on two factors, namely the testimony of John Shirley and the internal evidence offered by the rhyme in ll. 13-14 of the Ballad. Shirley's attribution is found in MS Addit. 16165 and is repeated in two manuscripts dependent on Shirley, Harley 7333 and Addit. 34360. It is, however, well-known that Shirley's attributions and texts are not above question. Alternatively, if Shirley is worthy of credence here, it may well be argued that Halsham "made" the Ballad by the simple expedient of borrowing two Lydgate stanzas. Dr. South furthermore believed that MS Fairfax 16 was the earliest and best MS of this text. This MS was, however, recently dated "mid-15th Cent." in the Bodleian *Summary Catalogue* (No. 3896), at which period Shirley was either very old or dead, it may be questioned, then, whether this MS is older than Addit. 16165. Next it may be noted that in the Fairfax MS Halsham is not noted as the author and the stanzas are found in conjunction with other Lydgatean lines as noted above. Dr. South believed that the Fairfax text represents the correct version because the rhyme in lines 13-14 is *infortune Lune* whereas Lydgate's poem is presumed to have *infortune lyne* (i. e. *lyne*). It is significant, it seems to me, that in the Shirley MSS, which alone attribute the poem to Halsham, violence is done to the rhyme by the readings *infortune loyne*, *loygne*, *loynne*. On the other

## MODESTY IN THE AUDIENCE

Mr. Maurice Evans, in a "mass-interview" at his theatre with 1600 students as reported in the *Herald-Tribune* of December 2, told them that "very young children get profoundly embarrassed by love scenes." He did not say whether this was the case at Shakespeare performances. Certainly there is far more occasion for embarrassment at modern plays, and if children are put out by Shakespeare's love scenes it is because of the way they are now acted. Physical familiarity or intimacy is seldom suggested in the text, and the reason (which I have touched on before<sup>1</sup>) is, I think, now more than ever apparent. The Elizabethan spectators were like children (the words "very young" seeming to me superfluous) and would have been embarrassed.

Not that (any more than our children) they were innocent, "sweet-minded," pure in heart. The Elizabethan audience delighted in smutty jokes, and most vigorous youngsters who have not been well guarded and educated do so too. The point is that ordinary healthy human beings, whether children in fact or the children of nature only that the Elizabethans were, do not relish

hand, is it impossible that Lydgate's poem originally also had *lune* and that *lyne* is no more than a graphic variant or scribal error? In the twelve stanzas of the poem as printed by MacCracken, the last word appears as *luyne* no fewer than six times, while *luyne* is a perfectly good form for *lune* (*OED* records *tuyne* for *tune*, *ruyle* for *rule*, *muyle* for *mule*, etc.), it is difficult to see how it could stand for *lune*. As bad as some of Lydgate's verse unquestionably is, it strikes me as entirely unlikely that he would ever have written a poem in which the refrain failed to rhyme. If, then, it is not impossible that Lydgate originally wrote *lune* (> *luyne* > *lyne*), the argument based on the superiority of the Fairfax text collapses. (Of course, the Caxton-Huntington text is very late, here it is made clear that *lyne* stands for *lune* by the rhyme *lyne fyne*.) We must also note that the first Halsham stanza corresponds not to the "opening strophe" of *A Pageant of Knowledge* but to stanza 23 of the seven-line version, that these stanzas, listed separately by Brown but printed as one poem by MacCracken, really belong together seems to be indicated by the refrain. Finally it may be pointed out that poems fashioned by combining various stanzas from Lydgate's other works have been fully treated in the previous footnote.

<sup>1</sup> My *Shakespeare's Young Lovers* (1937), pp. 52-53. I open up the question again, repeating a little that I said there, in order to take advantage of Mr. Evans' authority.

amorous demonstrations in public. They are unwilling to look at what they may be willing enough to read of or think about. On the stage or off it, in parks or in cars by the roadside, it brings blushes or laughter, if not a jeer. It is received, if at all, though less comfortably, like the smutty joke. And deliberately or instinctively the Elizabethan dramatists wrote to suit. What a difference between Shakespeare's love scenes and his *Venus with Adonis*, between Marlowe's *Tamburlaine with Zenocrate* and *Faustus with Helen*, on the one hand, and his *Hero with Leander*, on the other. *Venus and Adonis* and *Hero and Leander* were, we know, widely read, but put on the stage—or on our stage, either, for that matter—would have been insufferable—too much simply to jeer at.

The public sense of decorum even in our shameless and lawless days is far in advance of the private and in Elizabethan times was still more so. In my highly respectful and amicable disagreement with Mr. Granville-Barker I endeavored to show that this was not owing to the fact that women's parts were played by boys. The Elizabethan audience, accustomed (like their fathers and forefathers and all the rest of the world) to no other players for the parts, would have been in danger of laughing or jeering only at the embraces or caresses, not at the actual boy who received them. It is a curious fact that on the French stage until a generation or two ago the kissing of men and women was only suggested, and the reason that it has not been infrequent on the English stage is simply that in Elizabethan life it was a matter of common courtesy. Yet on the late Jacobean stage, as the moral tone degenerated, and on the Restoration stage, as the tone degenerated still further and the boys were replaced by women, how little evidence there is of kissing or fondling in the text! There are scarcely any caresses and little imagining of them, either, such as there are in the lyrics then or since. The voluptuousness is still by way of the joking, though now the witticisms on the lips of the high-class characters are less gross but more ingenious and insidious. The audience hear improprieties enough but witness none, and the improprieties are of course, even as in Elizabethan times, less exciting or corrupting because the effect is dissolved in merriment. Wit mitigates the indecency, laughter palliates the shame. The theatre, so far as the spectators themselves are concerned, is the place for laughter or tears, for exultation or terror, not for blushes, we must be able to look our companions or neighbors comfortably in the eye. And it

is disconcerting for them and so for us (and then for the actors in turn) to laugh when they are wincing—whether at sheer indecency in speech or at an amorous intimacy proper enough if in solitude

The laughter, whether wholehearted or mingled with sentiment and tears, should be unanimous and by the players expected. In love-making, even when truly romantic and wholly irreproachable, merriment, either as actually on the stage or only as duly expected in the house, is generally welcome. It is for want of this today that children and some few adults are embarrassed, as well as because of the indecorum of the players. The bright accompaniment to the tender tune is provided in Shakespeare from *Love's Labour's Lost* even to *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*, though there is more of wit and humour at the beginning and of naïveté and fantasy towards the end. This is not exact and faithful realism. Lovers don't joke much—to either the other's intentions then would not seem sufficiently serious—in fact they don't talk much, and they do embrace.

And yet how in Fletcher and in the Restoration dramatists, just as in Shakespeare, though differently and less charmingly, the romantic lovers keep their distance and let their tongues run on! The wooing is a wit combat or, as between Congreve's *Mirabell* and *Millamant*, a "proviso" scene. Even in some contemporary plays, like Maugham's *Circle*, it is still voluble, still witty and meriy. And why so? Partly because these plays are comedies and must live up to expectations. (But *Romeo and Juliet* is not a comedy.) Partly (and much more) because the medium of all plays, unlike that of novels, is dialogue and action. Now the natural action is here, as we have seen already, avoided. And as for dialogue the Shakespearean medium is also poetry, the lovers are not poets, any more than Hamlet or Lear or Macbeth, though lately taken for such—any more than Mozart's *Don Giovanni* and *Leporello* are musicians—and though flesh-and-blood lovers may meditate the muse they do it painfully, in solitude, and mostly to painful effect. Shakespeare's, particularly his maidens, are not aware that they are poetical, nor are they so with lyrical license and abandon. For caresses by word of mouth, however poetical, are not much more acceptable on the stage than those by the touch. A lyric of Swinburne or Rossetti, even the corresponding chapter in Meredith or Hardy, cannot well be enacted. But love scenes on the stage must

be acceptable or else be forborne By some dramatists, Molière for instance, they are By others, like Corneille, they have been dramatized, the passion pitted against duty or honour. By still others the passion has been thrown under the shadow of death By Shakespeare, among them, and there would, of course, have been no temptation to laugh or jeer as Cleopatra receives Antony in the monument. But Shakespeare and most of the English after him have preferred to present love in the sunlight, for its own sake, apart from tragic complications, and yet that they must in some way make dramatic too By wit and humour Shakespeare and the English have given liveliness to their scenes, something else than "love, and love, and love, my dear" to fill up the lines, and not only negatively—by the action improbably omitted—but positively—by the badinage improbably provided—have spared our blushes. Not a case of "imitation," it is (as often in art) one of substitution, and here (as also often in art) with the happiest results Who even today would rather look at or listen to lovers just as they move and talk and are? There is still a sense of shame in the theatre. There is still something else than realism on the stage. And "on admet en art," says Lanson, "un art qui dépasse la nature en la respectant."

These are not the only violations of realism in Shakespearean and Elizabethan love scenes, and some of these may seem to be in the other direction The maidens often put on hose and doublet and in the wooing sometimes meet their lovers more than half way. They even follow them up when they have departed All this, too, I have elsewhere endeavoured to show, was not, as it has been said to be, true to life It is to be found not only in Elizabethan drama but in the novels before it, and not only there but also in the drama and novels and court epics of Italy and Spain, where women were still more carefully guarded and there can, in this connection, be no question of realism at all. This sort of irregularity, or impropriety, however, would obviously cause no uneasiness in the audience and bring no blush to any healthy cheek It produces no sensation as the caresses or embraces do Propriety is overridden by the dramatist or poet only in the interest of romance, and then the boldness, if not of pure love, becomes a measure of the love—if with grace and charm, heightens the charm. Shakespeare's maidens in love, indeed, are still more unrealistic than those of the other



Elizabethans or the continental poets They are whole-hearted, they do not coquet Yet they are the most delightful and at the same time the most convincing ever staged.

In all the arts there is substitution, manipulation, something of pretence or make-believe Description, as any good writer knows, must conspire with narration Not space but time is the literary element, not shape and colour but movement, and in good description the verbs involve it The mountain rises, instead of standing, the plain stretches, does not lie Painting, in turn, does all in its power to reach beyond the limits of its two dimensions and the colours of the palette It too deals with appearances, not facts. Perspective—foreshortening—is a falsification of the bare facts in the interests of a higher reality, and snow to seem like snow and have the effect of it in a picture is not, as would be expected, painted white.

Quite as much adjustment is required for the stage, and in earlier times that was more boldly and frankly supplied Improbable stories like those of Hamlet and Lear, Macbeth and Othello, Œdipus and Orestes, for otherwise unattainable enthralling situations—large elements of melodrama in order, as Mr L. A. G. Strong has it, to “exhibit character at the highest pitch of intensity”—but on the subject of plot and fable we cannot here embark <sup>2</sup>

Others than the lovers are unnaturally loquacious, Hotspur and Henry V, for instance, true Englishmen both, who protest that they are men not of words but deeds. For the leading rôles deeds are not enough. And to those of us who psychologically peer and pry, many of the other characters now seem still more self-conscious, but not to the Elizabethan or the Athenian audience. The grief-stricken, like Constance and King Lear, parade their grief or cherish it Villains like Richard III and Iago, but unlike the criminals we know of, avow their villainy, cowards like Parolles and Falstaff, but unlike those we know of, betray or joke about their cowardice Even the heroic are at times made aware of their heroism, the innocent of their innocence. And hypocrites like Richard and Iago, but unlike the hypocrites we know of, put on or off the white mask or cloak before our eyes. In France this treatment of hypocrisy by Molière, which (independently of course) is similar to that by Shakespeare, is recognized to be owing to the

<sup>2</sup> Cf my *Shakespeare and Other Masters* (1940), p 202, etc

*optique du théâtre.* Though to meet other requirements or overcome prejudices of a different sort, the adjustments above mentioned are made for the perspective too

"The transcript of his sense of fact," says Pater of the fine prose-writer, "rather than the fact, as being preferable, pleasanter, more beautiful to the writer himself!" But drama is (if it is any) a far more popular art, a matter, moreover, not of beauty merely but of power, and of the taste of the writer only in so far as this is at one with that of his audience. It is a matter also of immediate effect, and that highly charged. (Why go to the theatre if the effect there is not to be more powerful than from what is read?) And to produce it, so as to be both pleasing and moving to everybody, requires a double dose—a profounder sense of fact and (if need be) more of a change brought upon it. Shakespeare's love scenes, apparently among his closest approaches to realism, seem a case in point

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

*University of Minnesota*

## THE DATE OF THE *CID* IN ENGLISH

In his study of Pierre Corneille in English translation and on the English stage in the 17th century, published in 1900,<sup>1</sup> Dr. Alfred Mulert called attention to the apparent proximity of the dates of the appearance of the first edition of the *Cid* in Paris and of that of Joseph Rutter's English translation of the same play in London. Says Dr. Mulert, speaking of this "höchst merkwürdige und leider nicht genügend aufzuhellende Thatsache"

Aus einem einfachen Vergleich der Daten ergibt sich nämlich, dass der *Cid* in Paris und eine englische Übersetzung desselben Dramas in Blankversen von Joseph Rutter in London ungefähr gleichzeitig aufgeführt und gedruckt worden sind. Zwei Exemplare dieser Übersetzung finden sich in der Bibliothek des Britischen Museums vor. Auf dem Titelblatte<sup>2</sup> ist 1637 als Erscheinungsjahr angegeben. Genauer bestimmt wird das Datum

<sup>1</sup> "Pierre Corneille auf der englischen Bühne und in der Englischen Übersetzungs-Literatur des Siebzehnten Jahrhunderts" in *Münchener Beiträge zur Romanischen und Englischen Philologie*, XVIII, 1900

<sup>2</sup> Here a footnote quoting the title page, see below

durch den am Ende des Werkchens beigefügten Abdruck der Druckerlaubnis Diese lautet "*This Tragicoedy etc may be printed Henry Herbert Janu 12 1637*" Auf der nächsten Seite steht "*Imprimatur Tho Wykes Jan 26 1637*" Wenn wir damit vergleichen, dass es in der französischen Originalausgabe heisst "*Le privilège est daté du 21 janvier 1637,*" so ergibt sich die interessante und bisher wohl kaum beachtete Tatsache, dass die englische Übersetzung zur gleichen Zeit gedruckt wurde, wie das französische Original Der Druck der letzteren war am 23. März 1637 beendet.<sup>3</sup>

Miss Dorothea Canfield, in her continuation, development, and expansion of Mulert's work four years later,<sup>4</sup> followed the latter's lead on this subject

One might not see in this [the fact that the presentation of Rutter's piece was so well received that he was commissioned to translate the 'second part' of the play<sup>5</sup>] anything noteworthy beyond a further proof of the

<sup>3</sup> Mulert, *op cit*, pp 2, 3 Emile Picot (*Bibliographie Cornélienne*, Paris, 1876, item 902, p 357) had made a rather equivocal statement about these dates, but apparently carried the matter no farther "*Malgré l'empressement mis par un poète anglais à traduire le Cid, l'année même de sa publication, le tempérament britannique ne paraît pas s'être accommodé aux passions toutes méridionales du héros espagnol*" (Italics mine)

<sup>4</sup> *Cornelle and Racine in England*, New York, 1904

<sup>5</sup> Miss Canfield (p 4), following Mulert, turns to the account of the translation in David Erskine Baker's *Biographia Dramatica* (which, for some reason, Miss Canfield refers to throughout her book as *Biographica*) "When executed it was so well approved by the King, to whom it was shown, that at his Majesty's own desire the second part of the same piece was put into Mr Rutter's hands with an injunction to translate it, which he immediately obeyed" She adds in a footnote "This 'Second part of the Cid' is a translation of *La Vraie Suite du Cid, de l'abbé Desfontaines*, 1637 The English translation was published in 1640, and as late as 1699 is still cited by Langbaine [*The Lives and Characters of the English Dramatick Poets*, London, p 119] as a translation from Corneille" The authorship of this sequel is no secret (cf Picot, *op cit*, p 357 and item 1392, p 480, and Lancaster, H C, *A History of French Dramatic Literature in the Seventeenth Century*, Part II, vol I, Baltimore, 1932, p 147, footnote 5), and is of no interest here except that to Miss Canfield's footnote might now be added that as late as 1926 the *Short Title Catalogue* still cites the play as belonging to Corneille (*A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, etc* edited by A W Polard and G R Redgrave, London, 1926, p 128) This mistake may be due to the misleading listing in the British Museum catalogue (I have consulted only the printed catalogue) where this translation of the *Second Part* is not listed separately, nor under *Desfontaines*, despite the fact that the original French edition is to be found under the latter heading Under

interest of the English Court in French tragedy were it not for the date of the translation, which is given clearly in the British Museum copies as January 26, 1637 (O S). Now the date of the French privilege is given as the 21 *Janvier*, 1637 (N S), while the play was not actually printed until March 23, 1637 (N S). These dates establish the curious and significant fact that Corneille's epoch-making play was printed in English as soon as in French.

It has never been possible to determine the exact date of the first representation of *Le Cid* in Paris. It is quite as impossible to ascertain when the English translation was first acted, but it must have been presented before it was printed, as the title-page reads, 'The Cid a Tragicomedy, out of French made English and acted before their Majesties at Court and on the Cockpitt Stage in Drury Lane, by the servants to both their Majesties'.

This early date of the English production makes a different matter of the whole affair. For it almost certainly presupposes the fact that the Earl of Dorset<sup>6</sup> obtained a manuscript copy of the *Cid* while the play was still the very latest novelty and sensation in Paris. This in its turn indicates on his part an attention to theatrical affairs in Paris far keener than would be shown by the simple translation of a printed book that might be easily obtained in London from any returned traveller. With all the immense advance in means of communication between France and England, it would have been surprising if *Cyrano de Bergerac* had been translated and played in London before it was printed in Paris.<sup>7</sup>

As far as I know, this impression has not been publicly corrected.<sup>8</sup> Although Miss Canfield took cognizance by her parentheses of the difference in date systems, she apparently did not find these

*P. Corneille* proper, Rutter's translation of the *Cid*, only, is listed, while under *Diaz de Bivar* (the general heading for *Cid* items), this item appears

The Cid, a tragicomedy [by Pierre Corneille] out of French made English [with alterations, by J. Rutter. Two parts, each in five acts and in verse] London 1637-40 12°

This second part is the Desfontaines piece, attest Mulert, *op cit*, p. 5

<sup>6</sup> Edward Sackville (1591-1652), fourth Earl of Dorset, Lord Chamberlain to the Queen. Canfield, following Langbaine and others, states that Rutter undertook the translation at the command of Dorset, one of whose dependents he was, and to whose sons he was tutor. See the closing remarks of this article.

<sup>7</sup> Canfield, *op cit*, pp. 4, 5

<sup>8</sup> Of the dozen or more periodicals consulted, but one reviewed Miss Canfield's work. There, the reviewer, R. Mahrenholtz (*ZfSL*, xxviii (1905), Zweite Hälfte Referate und Rezensionen, pp. 113, 4), accepts her conclusions. "*Le Cid* übersetzt von Joseph Rutter 1637, wahrscheinlich nach französischem Msc." The same error is found in Allardyce Nicoll's *History of Restoration Drama*, Cambridge, 1923, p. 87.

remarkable circumstances sufficiently "surprising" to consider whether the date of the Rutter translation might not be January 1637-38 instead of 1636-37.<sup>9</sup> Reference to the *Stationers Register* would have indicated this to be the case. The entry as it there stands<sup>10</sup> is as follows

29° Januarii [1638]

Thomas Walkley Entred for his Copy vnder the hands of Sir HENRY HERBERT / Master WYKES and Master Aspley warden a Play called '*The Cid*' / a Tragi-comedy out of Ffrench [of PIERRE CORNEILLE] By Master RUTTER

The printing of the English translation, then, followed the French printing at the distance of a year this fact "makes a different matter of the whole affair"<sup>11</sup> The actual circumstances are not known, but it is probable that Rutter, himself a dramatic writer of sorts,<sup>12</sup> came into possession of a copy of the French success, and, perhaps, having set his young charges at the exercise of translating it,<sup>13</sup> became himself interested in the undertaking, eventually being "commanded" by the busy lord of Knole House to bring the work to the public boards and press. In any case, the extremely abnormal course of events which Mulert and Canfield project or imply can certainly be discounted, and the story of the first English translation of the *Cid* reduced to an interesting, but far from unusual, tale

JOHN R. KLEINSCHMIDT

*Brown University*

<sup>9</sup> I am grateful to Professor Harcourt Brown for this suggestion

<sup>10</sup> *A Transcript of the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554-1640 A. D.*, edited by Edward Arber, London, vol. IV, 1877, p. 380 (of entries, p. 406 of the volume)

<sup>11</sup> The establishment of this fact removes a pivotal argument of those who date the first performance of the French play 1636 instead of January, 1637

<sup>12</sup> He had written and seen produced a pastoral tragi-comedy which had won the praise of Ben Jonson *The Shepheard's Holy-Day*, London, 1635

<sup>13</sup> The *Dictionary of National Biography* (I, 31), in discussing Rutter's translation states "Part of the translation is said to have been the work of Rutter's pupils Richard Sackville, afterwards Earl of Dorset, and Edward (d. 1645)," and again (p. 91) *re* the same Richard (born 1622) who as Lord Buckhurst, contributed, as did his tutor himself, an elegy to the *Jonsonus Vir bonus* published in 1638 "Aubrey says that Samuel Butler told him that Dorset translated the '*Cid*' of Corneille into English verse (*Aubrey MSS* VII, 9, VIII, 20) "

THREE NOTES ON FRENCH AUTHORS DESPORTES,  
GUÉROULT, RONSARD1. *Desportes and Marullus*

M. Jacques Lavaud in discussing the sources of Desportes commits himself to the flat negative 'De Marulle, Desportes n'a rien tiré'<sup>1</sup> It is annoying to have one's casual remarks taken up in a literal sense, and very likely Desportes' characteristic work owes nothing to Marullus, but out in the margin, so to speak, of his poems there is an unconsidered trifle that spoils Lavaud's sentence. Among Desportes' rare epigrams the following is ultimately from the Greek Anthology (A.P. 9. 456)<sup>2</sup>

Quand par les rochers montagneux  
Pasiphae, de fureur contrainte,  
Suiroit son amant dedaigneux,  
On dit qu'elle fit cette plainte  
O Vénus, fille de la mer!  
Qui causes ma flamme enragée,  
Puis qu'un bœuf tu me fais aimer,  
Qu'en vache ne m'as-tu changée?

The anonymous Greek verses have more point

Πασιφάη πρὸς τὸν Ἔρωτα  
Εἰ ποθέειν μ' ἐδίδαξας ἐν οὐρεσι ταῦρον ἀλήτην,  
μυκηθμόν με διδάξον, ὅτῳ φίλον ἔνδρα καλέσσω

Pasiphae to Eros

If you have taught me to love a bull that strays in the mountains, teach me to low, so that I may summon my beloved

'Teach me to low' possesses at least a certain degree of humor, whereas 'Qu'en vache ne m'as-tu changée?' is stale and pointless. Desportes cannot have had the Greek original before him. In the second place, what the Greek gives in a title, namely the occasion of the appeal, Desportes puts in his first four lines. And finally, in his epigram Pasiphae calls upon Venus, but in the Greek upon

<sup>1</sup> *Un Poète de cour au temps des derniers Valois, Philippe Desportes*, Paris, 1936, p. 193

<sup>2</sup> *Œuvres*, ed by Michiels, Paris, 1858, p. 444; the verses first came into Desportes' works in the edition of 1600 (Lavaud, *op cit*, p. 443)

Eros. These three departures from the original are found in Marullus' imitation of the Greek epigram <sup>3</sup>

Cum male formosum sequeretur in avia taurum  
Sic Venerem contra Gnosia questa feram est  
Si mihi bos fuerat, dea, vir te dante futurus,  
Cur non insanae Praetidos ora dabas?

Perhaps Marullus, following the Greek, means *ora* = voice; but Desportes, following only Marullus, naturally understood *ora* = face or form.

## 2. Guillaume Guérout and Guolamo Angeriano

Some one with an interest in the minor poetry of the sixteenth century, whether it be Italian, French, or English, could profitably make a study of the influence of Angeriano's *Ἐρωτοαίγυιον*, which was a mine of those gallant conceits in which that poetry delighted <sup>4</sup> I note at random Angeriano's influence on Luigi Groto, Michel d'Amboise, Ronsard, and the elder Giles Fletcher Here we have to record his traces in the *Premier Livre des Emblèmes* of Guérout (Lyons, 1550) <sup>5</sup> Emblem 18, *D'un peintre amoureux d'une Dame*, is from Angeriano's *De Caelae Pictura* <sup>6</sup> Since the poem of Guérout is long and the poet not very important, I give only enough lines of both poems to prove the debt

Comment, ce dist elle,  
Si ie suis cruelle  
Ou tant rigoureuse,  
Pourquoy gracieuse  
M'as tu voulu faire?  
Or sur cest affaire  
Ie luy dis alors  
Iay suivy du corps  
L'externe apparence,

<sup>3</sup> *Hymni et Epigrammata*, Bologna, 1504, sig B 12 Marullus' Latin poems were repeatedly printed in the sixteenth century, possibly for Desportes the most accessible edition would be *Poetae tres Elegantissimi, emendati et aucti, M Marullus, H Angerianus, J Secundus*, ed by L Martellus, Paris (Duval), 1582

<sup>4</sup> The *Ἐρωτοαίγυιον* was first published at Florence in 1512, then simultaneously at Paris and at Naples in 1520, and there were several later editions

<sup>5</sup> Ed by De Vaux de Lancey, Rouen, 1937, p 47

<sup>6</sup> *Ἐρωτ*, Naples, 1520, sig b4.

Car peindre ie doy  
 Ce qu'a l'œil ie voy,  
 Et non pas la chose  
 Que tu tiens enclose,  
 Et que ton cœur pense

Si sum tam tetrica, et qui me sectantur amantes,  
 Expallent, mitis cui ego pingor? ait  
 Cui pictor Placidum facies tua signat amorem,  
 Quod latet in tacito pectore nemo videt .

### 3. Ronsard and Virgil

In Ronsard's *Discours sur la poésie héroïque*, published posthumously in 1597 as a preface to his *Franciade*, the poet, pronouncing against modern Latin verse in favor of the vernacular, exclaims 'O quantesfois ay-je souhaité que les divines testes et sacrées aux Muses de Joseph Scaliger, Daurat [etc], voulussent employer quelques heures à si honorable labeur,

Gallica se quantis attolet gloria verbis!'

On this Latin verse Pierre de Nolhac's comment is 'Ce vers pourrait être, par jeu, de Ronsard lui-même.' If de Nolhac could momentarily forget Virgil, there is a chance that subsequent commentators may also miss the point. Ronsard, of course, parodies the words of Anna to Dido (*Aen.* 4. 49) If Dido can but get Aeneas for her husband, what a kingdom she will have, and

Teucrum comitantibus armis  
 Punica se quantis attolet gloria rebus

The line is indeed 'par jeu de Ronsard lui-même,' but the play is not that which de Nolhac probably had in mind.

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

### ROUSSEAU AND FAUST

Romantic yearning for the infinite is strongly marked in both Rousseau and Goethe. The lines of Henry Van Dyke on Shelley

Knight errant of the never ending quest  
 And minstrel of the unfulfilled desire

<sup>1</sup> *Ronsard et l'humanisme*, Paris, 1921, p 245, n 6



frequently come to mind in reading Rousseau or *Faust*. Hence the comparison of a passage in *La Cinquième Réverie* with the wager between Faust and Mephistopheles may not be without interest. It will be remembered that in previous versions of the legend the compact was for a limited period—usually twenty-four years—and that Goethe was the first to make the term a moment of perfect satisfaction to Faust. I have not been able to learn the exact date at which the wager was introduced by Goethe into the poem. In the fragment, published in 1790, the scene begins some seventy lines further on.

Und was der ganzen Menschheit zugeteilt ist,  
Will ich in meinem, innern Selbst genießen

Apparently, in 1790, Goethe had not determined on the exact form the wager was to take. The first part of this scene would seem to have been composed after 1800. The first part of *Faust*, complete, was published in 1808. The *Réveries* were written between 1776 and 1778, and first published in 1782. In the fifth we find this passage:

Tout est dans un flux continuel sur la terre. Rien n'y garde une forme constante et arrêtée, et nos affections qui s'attachent aux choses extérieures passent et changent nécessairement comme elles. Toujours en avant ou en arrière de nous, elles rappellent le passé, qui n'est plus, ou préviennent l'avenir, qui souvent ne doit point être, il n'y a rien là de solide à quoi le cœur se puisse attacher. Aussi n'a-t-on guère ici-bas que du plaisir qui passe; pour le bonheur qui dure, je doute qu'il y soit connu. A peine est-il, dans nos plus vives jouissances, un instant où le cœur puisse véritablement nous dire *Je voudrais que cet instant durât toujours*. Et comment peut-on appeler bonheur un état fugitif qui nous laisse le cœur inquiet et vide, qui nous fait regretter quelque chose avant, ou désirer encore quelque chose après?

Faust's compact with Mephistopheles runs as follows:

*Faust*    Werd' ich beruhigt je mich auf ein Faulbett legen,  
              So sei es gleich um mich getan!  
              Kannst du mich schmeichelnd je belügen,  
              Dass ich mir selbst gefallen mag,  
              Kannst du mich mit Genuss betrügen,  
              Das sei für mich der letzte Tag!  
              Die Wette biet'ich!

*Mephistopheles*    Topp!

*Faust*    Und Schlag auf Schlag!  
              Werd' ich zum Augenblicke sagen:

Verweile doch! du bist so schon!  
Dann magst du mich in Fesseln schlagen

I would not venture to claim a direct source in Rousseau's lines, but the mood expressed is strikingly similar to that of Faust in certain of his early speeches and in his conversations with Mephistopheles.<sup>1</sup> Here then is a bit of concrete evidence that Rousseau's appeal to Goethe continued into his maturity.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE

Reed College

### THREE SOURCES OF VIGNY'S JOURNAL

The background of Vigny's reading from 1833 to 1835 included three authors whose influence on the French poet may need more emphasis.

Under the date June 20, 1833, we read in the *Journal d'un poète* "Éros.—L'esclave de Néron, Éros, se tue devant lui pour l'encourager à mourir."<sup>1</sup> Vigny's memory failed him at this point. Plutarch, whom he had been reading, relates the incident of Éros, the slave of Antony.<sup>2</sup> There is no record of such an act in connection with Nero.

The horizon of Vigny's reading in 1834 is seen to have been further extended by his notes on Joseph de Maistre. Once more what appears as an original observation in the *Journal* is taken directly from a book Vigny was absorbing "La philosophie antique renfermait toute la sagesse humaine dans cette maxime Souffre et abstiens-toi. Ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου, sentant que nos plus

<sup>1</sup> Possibly the passage from Rousseau may throw some light on the much discussed lines 1675 ff "Was willst du armer Teufel geben?" Faust will have none of the known satisfactions which man or devil can offer, his is a never ending quest, in a moment of intense agony of mind he had contemplated suicide, he is certain now that Mephisto cannot win the wager, but as he had refrained from taking his own life—

"Man sehnt sich nach des Lebens Bachen,  
Ach! nach des Lebens Quelle hin,"

he resolves to continue his quest, although without any illusion of hope

<sup>2</sup> Conard edition, edited by Baldensperger, 1935, I, 266.

<sup>3</sup> *Lives*, v, 123 Burt & Co

fortes inclinations sont vicieuses et tendent à la destruction de la Société. La loi chrétienne fait de cette victoire continuelle sur nous un précepte éternel. Donc l'individu est reconnu partout comme ennemi naturel de la Société" . . .<sup>3</sup>

Joseph de Maistre had written "La philosophie seule avait deviné depuis longtemps que toute la sagesse de l'homme était renfermée en deux mots Sustine et Abstine (souffre et abstiens-toi C'est le fameux *Ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου* des Stoiciens) . . . elle a fort bien compris que les plus fortes inclinations de l'homme étant vicieuses au point qu'elles tendent évidemment à la destruction de la société, il n'avait pas de plus grand ennemi que lui-même. . . . Mais la loi chrétienne . . . fait de l'abstinence en général, ou de la victoire habituelle remportée sur nos désirs, un précepte capital qui doit régler toute la vie de l'homme" . . .<sup>4</sup>

The poet's reflections on "Fatalité et Providence"<sup>5</sup> are inspired likewise by Joseph de Maistre.<sup>6</sup> So are those on "le bourreau,"<sup>7</sup> "Gravité,"<sup>8</sup> and "le mal"<sup>9</sup>

The author of *Stello* and *Servitude* expressed satisfaction on reading in 1835 that Goethe "fut ennuyé des questions de tout le monde sur la vérité de *Werther*. On ne cessait de s'informer à lui de ce qu'il renfermait de *vrai*."<sup>10</sup> He had been reading *Dichtung und Wahrheit* in which Goethe says, "denn anstatt dass mir jemand über mein Buchlein, wie es lag, etwas Verbindliches gesagt hatte, so wollten sie sämtlich ein für allemal wissen, was denn eigentlich an der Sache wahr sei?"<sup>11</sup>

C WESLEY BIRD

Fresno State College,  
Fresno, California

<sup>3</sup> *Op cit*, I, 290 Cf the same, lacking the Greek, I, 286

<sup>4</sup> *Souées de Saint-Petersbourg*, Premier Entretien

<sup>5</sup> *Journal*, 1834, I, 295

<sup>6</sup> *Op cit*, Premier Entretien

<sup>7</sup> *Journal*, 1834, I, 296 Cf Premier Entretien

<sup>8</sup> *Journal*, 1834, I, 301 Cf J de Maistre, Garnier ed, II, 63

<sup>9</sup> *Journal*, 1834, I, 306 Cf Premier Entretien, I, 21

<sup>10</sup> *Journal*, 1835, I, 329 The italics are Vigny's

<sup>11</sup> *Goethes Werke in sechs Banden*, Leipsig, Vol 5, pt III, bk 13, p 426.

## A NOTE ON SHELLEY AND MILTON

An extended investigation of the sources of Shelley's poetry has convinced the present writer that Shelley's debt to Milton is greater than Professor Havens's book on the influence of Milton would lead readers to believe. The following selected list of verbal parallels is not intended to be exhaustive but may be of assistance to any one proposing to study the extent of Milton's influence on Shelley.

- 1                               Every sight  
And sound from the vast earth and ambient air (*Alastor*, 68-9)  
This which yields or fills  
All space, the ambient Aire wide interfus'd  
Imbracing round this florid Earth (*P L*, VII, 88-90)  
The phrase occurs also in Southey's *Curse of Kehama* (IX, 4) and in  
Young's *Night Thoughts* (VIII, 1, 186) Southey and Milton are  
more likely sources than Young
- 2 Divine philosophy (*Alastor*, 71)  
Divine philosophy (*Comus*, 475)  
Shelley quotes the lines from *Comus* which contain this phrase in his  
review of Godwin's *Mandeville* which appeared in Hunt's *Ex-*  
*aminer*, Dec 28, 1817 (*Prose*, Julian edition, VI, 221 )
- 3                               He eagerly pursues  
Beyond the realms of dream that fleeting shade,  
He overleaps the bounds (*Alastor*, 205 7)  
But true love never yet  
Was thus constrained, it overleaps all fence (*Eppis* , 397-8)  
Due entrance he disdained, and in contempt  
At one slight bound high overleap'd all bound (*P L*, IV, 180-81)
- 4 Dark, gleaming, and of most translucent wave (*Alastor*, 458)  
Under the glassy, cool, translucent wave (*Comus*, 860)
- 5 They framed the imperial tent of their great Queen  
Of woven exhalations, underlaid  
With lambent lightning-fire, as may be seen  
A dome of thin and open ivory inland  
With crimson silk, cressets from the serene  
Hung there (*Witch of Atlas*, LIII, 16)  
Anon out of the earth a fabric huge  
Rose like an exhalation  
        and Doric pillars overlaid  
With golden architrave .  
The roof was fretted gold  
        ... from the arched roof

Pendant by subtle magic, many a row  
 Of starry lamps and blazing cressets fed  
 With naphtha and asphaltus yielded light  
 As from a sky (P L, I, 710-30)

- 6 The pinnacle, oared by those enchanted wings (Witch, XLV, 7)  
 Oaring with rosy feet its silver boat (Revolt of Islam, VII, XXVII, 2)

The Swan with Arched neck  
 Between her white wings mantling proudly, Rowes  
 Her state with Oarie feet (P L, VII, 438-40)

But one may also notice that James Thomson, another of the earlier  
 poets with whom Shelley was familiar, should perhaps have a  
 claim here

Swan with oary feet  
 Bears forward fierce (Spring, 780-81)  
 The boat light-skimming stretched its oary wings (Autumn, 129)

- 7 By many a star surrounded pyramid  
 Of icy crag cleaving the purple sky (Witch, XXXVIII, 6-7)  
 Under a star-ypointing Pyramid (On Shakespear, 4)

- 8 All gaunt  
 And sanguine beasts her gentle looks made tame  
 And every beast of beating heart grew bold,  
 Such gentleness and power even to behold,  
 The brinded lioness led forth her young  
 That she might teach them how they should forego  
 Their inborn thirst of death, the pard unstrung  
 His sinews at her feet (Witch VI, 4-8, VII, 1-4)

Hence had the huntress Dian her dred bow  
 Fair silver-shafted Queen for ever chaste,  
 Wherewith she tam'd the brinded lioness  
 And spotted mountain pard (Comus, 440-43)

Both poets are talking of the power of gentleness and chastity over  
 wild beasts

- 9 And first the spotted camelopard came,  
 And then the wise and fearless elephant,  
 Then the sly serpent, in the golden flame  
 Of his own volumes interwolved (Witch, VI, 1-4)

Bears, tigers, ounces, pards  
 Gambold before them, th'unwieldy elephant  
 To make them mirth us'd all his might, and wreathd  
 His lithe proboscis, close the serpent sly  
 Insinuating, wove with Gordian twine  
 His breaded train. (P L, IV, 344-49)

- 10 Plotting dark spells and devilish enginery. (Maria Gisborne, 107)  
 Training his devilish Enginrie (P L, VI, 553)

- 11 Noticed by Professor Havens has been the influence of Milton upon  
*Maria Gisborne* (198-99)

greater none than he,  
Though fallen—and fallen on evil times

though fall'n on evil days,  
On evil days though fall'n and evil tongues (P L, VII, 256)

An earlier echo of the same line appears in *Rosalind and Helen*  
(473-74),

Poverty  
Among the fallen on evil days

- 12 Morning sought  
Her eastern watch-tower (Adonais, XIV, 34)

And singing startle the dull night  
From his watch-towre in the skies (L'Allegro, 42-43)

- 13 The sun comes forth and many reptiles spawn (Adonais, XXIX, 1)  
Reptile with spawn abundant (P L, VII, 388)

- 14 The Fiend, whose name was Legion, Death, Decay,  
Earthquake and Blight and Want and Madness pale  
Winged and wan diseases, an array  
Numerous as leaves that strew the autumnal gale  
(Revolt Islam, I, XXIX, 14)

Till on the beach  
Of that inflamed sea he stood, and call'd  
His legions, angel forms, who lay entranc'd  
Thick as autumnal leaves that strow the brooks  
In Vallombrosa (P L, I, 299-303)

- 15 My vision then grew clear and I could see  
Into the mysteries of the universe  
Dizzy as with delight I floated down,  
Winnowing the lightsome air with languid plumes  
(Prometheus Unbound, III, IV, 1047)

From hence no cloud, or, to obstruct his sight,  
Starr interpos'd, however small he sees  
Earth and the Gard'n of God  
Down thither prone in flight  
He speeds, and through the vast Ethereal Skie  
Sailes between worlds and worlds, with steddie wing  
Now on the polar windes, then with quick Fann  
Winnows the buxom Air (P L, V, 257-70)

- 16 Under the gray beak of some promontory (Epips, 198)  
Up to some beaked cape of cloud sublime (Witch of Atlas, LV, 3)  
That blows from off each beaked promontory (Lycidas, 94)

- 17 Vegetable fire (Prometheus Unbound, III, IV, 110)  
Vegetable silver (Prometheus Unbound, IV, 283)  
Vegetable gold (Paradise Lost, IV, 220)

- 18 Sinks headlong through the aerial golden light (*Ode Liberty*, 275)  
Hurl'd headlong flaming from th'ethereal sky (*P L*, I, 45)
- 19 In a favorite figure of Shelley's, Ianthe's tresses shade her bosom  
(*Queen Mab*, I, 43-44),  
Curling like tendrils of the parasite  
Around a marble column  
It is likely that Shelley had Milton's Eve in his mind's eye, for her  
tresses, golden like Ianthe's (*P L*, IV, 305-7)  
in wanton ringlets wav'd  
As the vine curls her tendrils
- 20 Milton's Eve puts in another appearance in *The Sensitive Plant*, where  
the lady of the garden is called "an Eve in this Eden" (II, 2)  
and ministers to the flowers much as does Milton's heroine  
She lifted their heads with her tender hands,  
And sustained them with rods and osier-bands (II, 37-38)  
Oft stooping to support  
Each Flour of slender stalk, whose head though gay,  
Carnation, Purple, Azure, or aspect with Gold,  
Hung drooping unsustained, them she upstays  
Gently with Mirtle band (*P L*, IX, 427-31)

An echo from Milton in *The Revolt of Islam* (Canto I) requires a more extended explanation. Reviewing Shelley's poems in the *Examiner*, Leigh Hunt commented as follows on the passage in question "A magic and obscure circumstance then takes place, the result of which is that the woman and the serpent are seen no more, but that a cloud opens asunder and a bright and beautiful shape, which seems compounded of both, is beheld sitting on a throne—a circumstance apparently imitated from Milton."<sup>1</sup> Hunt does not trouble to be more specific but seems to have had in mind Satan's return to Pandemonium in Book x. 'Like the Serpent of Good in Shelley, Satan passes unseen through the assembled throng in his Plutonian Hall and ascends his throne.

Down a while  
He sate and round about him saw unseen  
At last as from a cloud his fulgent head  
And shape Starr-bright appeer'd, or brighter, clad  
With what permissive glory since his fall  
Was left him (*Paradise Lost*, x, 47-52)

<sup>1</sup> *Examiner*, Feb 1, 22, and March 1, 1818 Reprinted by Newman I. White, *The Unextinguished Hearth* See p 118

Shelley's description compares rather favorably (*Revolt of Islam*, I, lvn).

The cloud which rested on that cone of flame  
 Was cloven, beneath the planet sate a Form,  
 Fairer than tongue can speak or thought may frame,  
 The radiance of whose limbs rose like and warm  
 Flowed forth, and did with softest light inform  
 The shadowy dome, the sculptures and the state  
 Of those assembled shapes—with clinging charm  
 Sinking upon their hearts and mine He sate  
 Majestic yet most mild, calm yet compassionate

Shelley of course is presenting a good, Milton an evil character. Yet the scenes are not otherwise dissimilar. A shadowy hall is crowded with shapes, over the high throne in the middle hovers an apparently empty cloud, in the midst of which the assemblage presently becomes aware of a radiant and majestic male form who occupies the throne.

CARLOS BAKER

*Princeton University*

## REFERENCES TO THE DRAMA IN THE MILD MAY DIARY

There are a number of references to the theatre in the diary and accounts book of Sir Humphrey Mildmay for the years 1633-1652.<sup>1</sup> Mildmay, a country gentleman whose principal estate was at Danbury in Essex, spent much of his time in London and was a frequent playgoer in the years before the Civil Wars. The diary entries are brief and contain very little comment upon the performances, beyond an occasional observation such as "a base play," or "a pretty comedy." All too frequently the name of the play is omitted. The diarist's "expenses" at a play (never itemized) were usually about one shilling and sixpence, but ranged from sixpence to as much as seven shillings and sixpence when his wife was with him. The theatres visited include the Cockpit, the Globe, the Red Bull, and especially the Blackfriars.

Only one of Shakespeare's plays is mentioned, and that is *Othello*

<sup>1</sup> Harleian MSS No 454, British Museum. The writer is preparing for publication an annotated edition of the manuscript from a filmed copy in the possession of the Yale University library.



("The Moor of Venice") which Mildmay saw at the Blackfriars, May 6, 1635. The other plays which can be identified are, with the dates attended, as follows Ralph Mabbie's *The Spanish Bawd*, May 18, 1632, Fletcher and Massinger's *Rollo*, at the Globe, May 23, 1633,<sup>2</sup> Davenant's *The Wits*, at the Blackfriars, January 22, 1633-4,<sup>3</sup> Fletcher's *The Pastoral*, February 7, 1633-4,<sup>4</sup> *Lasander and Calista*<sup>5</sup> ("being a poem"), May 21, 1634, Davenant's *Love and Honor*, December 12, 1634,<sup>6</sup> Fletcher's *The Elder Brother*, at the Blackfriars, April 25, 1635, Shirley's *The Lady of Pleasure* (a "rare play"), December 8, 1635,<sup>7</sup> and Fletcher's *The Mad Lover*,<sup>8</sup> May 21, 1639. Another dramatic allusion may be contained in the entry for Sunday, April 3, 1634 "After supper to the Spaniards Discipline." No play by this title has been discovered, but it is conceivable that the reference is to Dekker's tragedy *The Spanish Soldier* (or *The Noble Spanish Soldier*) which was entered on the books of the Stationers' Company in 1631 and 1633 and was printed in 1634.<sup>9</sup> "Cataline" (presumably Ben Jonson's *Catiline's Conspiracy*) Mildmay saw acted at court, Sunday, November 9, 1634.

<sup>2</sup> It was performed at court by the King's Men in January, 1637 Fleay, *Chronicle History of the London Stage*, p 349

<sup>3</sup> The play was licensed only three days before (January 19) J Q Adams, *Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p 35

<sup>4</sup> It was performed at the Cockpit in court by the King's Players on April 8 following Fleay, *op cit*, p 317

<sup>5</sup> According to Fleay this play, by Fletcher and Massinger, was based upon Daudiguier's *Lysandre et Caliste*, was licensed as *Cleander*, and was also called *The Lovers' Progress* Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, 219-20 *Cleander* was licensed by Herbert, May 7, 1634, and is reported to have been performed before the Queen at Blackfriars on May 13, 1634 Adams, *op cit*, pp 27, 35, 65 The diary entry indicates that the title of the French original was holding its own

<sup>6</sup> Licensed on November 20 preceding Adams, *op cit*, p 36

<sup>7</sup> Licensed on October 15 preceding *Ibid*, p 37

<sup>8</sup> Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, 207 It is listed among plays acted by the King's Company, 1660-1662 Adams, *op cit*, p 117 Possibly it is the same as *The Bridegroom and the Madman*, ascribed to Fletcher or Beaumont and Fletcher, and included in the King's Men's repertory of 1641 G M Sibley, *The Lost Plays and Masques, 1500-1642*, p 18

<sup>9</sup> Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, I, 128 J O Halliwell-Phillips, *Dictionary of Old English Plays*, pp 234-5 Fleay identified this play with Dekker's *The Spanish Fig* Cf also Sibley, *op cit*, p 150

The masque *The Triumph of Peace* by Shirley and Inigo Jones was performed twice in the month of February, 1633-4. The testimony of the diary helps to fix the exact dates of these performances, concerning which conflicting statements have persisted. Bulstrode Whitelock gives the date of the first exhibition, which took place at the Banqueting House, Whitehall, as Candlemas night, that is February 2.<sup>10</sup> A letter of February 14 from Robert Reade to Thomas Windebank names the 4<sup>th</sup>.<sup>11</sup> Mildmay, however, records that he saw the masque on the night of February 3, and this date is affirmed by Fleay,<sup>12</sup> who apparently used the diary as an unacknowledged source. The masque was repeated, at the king's request, in Merchant Taylors' Hall, on February 13, according to the diary, and this date is substantiated by Robert Reade's letter cited above. Fleay places the date of the second performance on Tuesday, February 11,<sup>13</sup> probably because he misread the diary entry for February 13 as February 11. He could easily have made this mistake because there are no entries for the 11th and 12th.

PHILIP L. RALPH

*Rutgers University*

## MILTON'S ENGLISH AGAIN

Despite the lack of a careful study of Milton's English, many scholars and critics have spoken in definite terms of its large borrowed element. Typical is the view expressed by Leonard Welstead in his *Dissertation Concerning the Perfection of the English Language* (1724). He speaks of "an uncouth unnatural jargon like the phrase and style of Milton, which is a second Babel, or confusion of languages."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Whitelock, *Memorials of the English Affairs*, I, 56-60.

<sup>11</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1633-4*, p. 464.

<sup>12</sup> *Chronicle History of the London Stage*, p. 318.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 318.

<sup>1</sup> *Works* (London, 1787), p. 123. For other similar statements see Addison, *Spectator* number 297 (Feb. 9, 1712), Samuel Johnson, *Lives of the Poets*, G. B. Hill edition (Oxford, 1905), I, 189-191, Max Schlicht, *The Influence of Latin and Greek on Milton's Vocabulary*, Rostock University diss. (1873), p. 4, R. D. Havens, *The Influence of Milton on English Poetry*

The confusion resulting when generalizations about an author's use of native and borrowed vocabulary are not based upon a careful, thorough investigation is nowhere more clearly illustrated than by the generalizations about Chaucer's diction. Until the publication of Joseph Mersand's etymological study<sup>2</sup> of every word Chaucer used, we had no exact statement of the native and borrowed element in Chaucer's vocabulary, though many Chaucerians had expressed views on the subject. That a similar confusion may exist in the traditional view of Milton's vocabulary, and that the greater part of Milton's vocabulary may be native in origin, has been suggested by Professor G. C. Taylor in his study of the words in "Lycidas."<sup>3</sup> It is my purpose here further to refute the prevailing notion of the alien quality of Milton's words by submitting the results obtained from a vocabulary study of "L'Allegro," and to comment briefly upon the method of pursuing such a study.

## I.

"L'Allegro" is a poem which contains 495 different words, 338 of the words are of native origin, 157 of foreign. The vocabulary of the poem is therefore 68 per cent native. A more significant fact revealed by this study is that all but 12 of the 495 words used appear in Middle English. If we consider as native any word in use before 1500, only approximately 2½ percent of the total vocabulary of "L'Allegro" is borrowed. This result is quite different from the figures cited by Marsh,<sup>4</sup> Masson,<sup>5</sup> and Hanford.<sup>7</sup> When we consider it with the result obtained by Professor Taylor,<sup>8</sup> we see the possibility that the traditional view of Milton's vocabulary is erroneous.

(Cambridge, 1922), p. 66, J. H. Hanford, *Milton Handbook* (New York, 1939), p. 294.

<sup>2</sup> *Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary* (Brooklyn, New York: The Comet Press, 1937).

<sup>3</sup> *Notes and Queries*, Jan. 27, 1940, pp. 56-7.

<sup>4</sup> This figure does not include proper names (18), prepositions (16), conjunctions (7), and articles (2).

<sup>5</sup> G. P. March, *Lectures on the English Language*, fourth edition (New York, 1862), p. 124. Masson and Hanford simply reproduce Marsh's figures.

<sup>6</sup> David Masson, *The Poetical Works of John Milton* (New York, 1893), III, 151-7.

<sup>7</sup> *Supra*, n. 1.

<sup>8</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 57.

The words not found in Middle English are

admit	invite
antique	perhaps
cynosure	quips
ebon	regained
frolic	rouse
horrid	secure

## II.

Marsh pointed out that there are two fundamentally different methods of conducting a study to determine the elements of an author's vocabulary (1) by examining the words "at rest," that is, by counting each different word only once and by disregarding the number of times any given word is used, and (2) by examining the words "in action," that is, by taking into account the number of times every word is used.<sup>9</sup> The composition of the English language makes it necessary to combine these two methods in arriving at a true evaluation of any literary vocabulary, since, although the borrowed elements in English form approximately two-thirds of the whole vocabulary, the native element is the framework. It is only natural, therefore, that when the words, as found in a dictionary or concordance, are examined with no regard to the relative frequency of use, the borrowed percentage becomes much larger than when frequency is considered. As Trench said in 1855

The Anglo-Saxon is not so much, as I have just called it, one element of the English language, as the foundation of it, the basis. All its joints, its whole articulation, its sinews and its ligaments, the great body of articles, pronouns, conjunctions, prepositions, numerals, auxiliary verbs, all smaller words which serve to knit together and bind the larger into sentences, these, not to speak of the grammatical structure of the language, are exclusively Saxon. The Latin may contribute its tale of bricks, yea, of goodly and polished hewn stones to the spiritual building, but the mortar, with all that holds and binds these together, and constitutes them into a house, is Saxon throughout.<sup>10</sup>

Behind this patriotic assertion lies a partial explanation for the over-emphasis on the borrowed element, chiefly Latin, of Milton's

<sup>9</sup> *Op cit*, pp 118 ff See also R C Trench, *English Past and Present* (New York, 1855), p 27

<sup>10</sup> *Op cit*, p 27

diction, for the investigations have been made of his language "at rest" with no consideration of the more important function of the native words in his language "in action"

Marsh's theory of vocabulary study was excellent, he emphasized the importance of both approaches and the great danger of drawing conclusions from an investigation of portions of a given author's writings. His method of presenting his findings, however, has resulted in a misinterpretation by later scholars.<sup>11</sup> We have seen that there is a wide divergence between the prevailing opinion of the elements of Milton's vocabulary and the results obtained by careful investigation, and it is evident that a thorough, scientific study of his language is needed to provide us with definite facts

Applied to "L'Allegro," Marsh's method yields significant results. Here Milton's language "at rest," as we have seen, is 68 per cent native. That "in action," however, is 75 per cent native.<sup>12</sup> If we include proper names, prepositions, conjunctions, and articles, moreover, the vocabulary "in action" is 81 per cent native.<sup>13</sup>

R. M. LUMIANSKY

*University of North Carolina*

### HAUSE AND SLAVES IN KING LEAR

1. In II, iv, 75-77,<sup>1</sup> the mocking fool, who has just given Kent his counsel of time-serving, turns his advice into a jibe. "When a

<sup>11</sup> Marsh found the native element of Milton's poetic vocabulary "at rest" to be 33 per cent, and that of the "L'Allegro" vocabulary "in action" 90 per cent, but gave no figure for the total vocabulary "in action" or the "L'Allegro" vocabulary "at rest." It is interesting to note that his figures on Chaucer's diction were similarly misunderstood by later Chaucerians. (See Mersand, *op cit*, pp 22-7)

<sup>12</sup> The vocabulary "in action" includes 647 words, 486 native, 161 borrowed. Proper names (18), prepositions (114), conjunctions (71), and articles (70) are excluded.

<sup>13</sup> Here the vocabulary "in action" includes 920 words, 741 native, 179 borrowed. Since Marsh presumably included proper names, prepositions, conjunctions, and articles, his 90 per cent native element (see above, n 11) is to be compared with the 81 per cent found here.

<sup>1</sup> The lineation of the Arden Edition is used.

wise man gives thee better counsel," he says, "give me mine again I would hause none but knaves follow it, since a fool gives it"

*Hause* is the reading of the Folio, and editors have united to reject it as a mere mistake for *haue*. Despite this consensus of opinion, *hause* seems almost certainly correct. It is derived from OE *halsian*, by the development of a diphthong before *l* plus a consonant, and by the subsequent loss of *l*, and both *NED.* and Wright's *Dialect Dictionary* offer evidence which indicates that the form is genuine.<sup>2</sup> The meaning, of course, is "to adjure" or "to beseech."

The only possible objection to *hause* must be based on a general theory of the relations between the Quartos and the Folio, and at present there is a great deal that could be said to prove the superiority not of the Quartos, only the first of which has any real value, but of the Folio. Even if the wildly improbable should occur and the first Quarto should be accepted as the primary source, there would still remain the fact that *hause* is far the more difficult reading. Housman's acid warning not to neglect inferior sources must be remembered, and often an elementary knowledge of linguistic history and a proper reverence for the more difficult variants will be more valuable than complicated theories.

2. In iv, 1, 68-70, Gloucester calls upon the gods

Let the superfluous and lust-dieted man,  
That slaves your ordinance, that will not see  
Because he doth not feel, feel your power quickly .

*Slaves* has given some difficulty. It is the Folio reading, and has usually been preferred to Quarto *stands*, though some editors have accepted *stands* in some such sense as "opposes," "withstands" The meaning of *slaves*, however, is not quite clear. Most often it has been interpreted to mean "enslaves," "treats as a slave", but Warburton's tentative emendation, *braves*, long ago suggested that this interpretation is not wholly satisfactory. An entirely different solution seems easier and more probable, if *slaves* be related to OE *slæfan*, NE *sleave*, which *NED.* glosses "to cleave, split, rend, tear apart."<sup>3</sup> Shakespeare pronounced the word with a long *e*,<sup>4</sup> for

<sup>2</sup> Wyld, *Short History of English*, §§ 218, 284 (3), see *NED* s v *Halse*

<sup>3</sup> *NED*'s *slive*, v 1, might also be compared

<sup>4</sup> Wyld, § 232

which sound an occasional spelling was *a*,<sup>5</sup> and a definite parallel is found in *NED*, which lists *slave*, v 2, as a rare and obsolete verb, meaning "to tear away or split," and quotes two instances dated 1523

JAMES SLEDD

*University of Texas*

## ON SIX OLD-ICELANDIC WORDS

In a recent reading of the description of twelfth-century Rome in the itinerary, or better pilgrim-diary of Nikolás, abbot of the Benedictine monastery at Munkaþverá (Eyjafjarðar sýsla), Iceland,<sup>1</sup> I have noticed five words used in senses not adequately analysed in the dictionaries and a sixth word which I do not understand

### I borg f "suburb"

The passage in Kálund (18, 15-17) runs *Vestr frá borginni er Páls Kirkja, þar er munnlífi ok borg um útan, er gengr or Róma* "To the west of the city (of Rome) is the church of S Paolo (fuori), where there is a monastery, and out around a suburb, which extends out from Rome" Now, the *borg* out around the basilica of S Lorenzo and adjacent monastery is (was) specifically the *suburb* of Iohannipolis,<sup>2</sup> and there can be no reasonable doubt

<sup>5</sup> Wyld, § 232 1 (c).

<sup>1</sup> Ed E C Werlauff, *Symbolae ad Geographiam Medii Aevi ex Monumentis islandicis* (Copenhagen, 1821), pp 22-4, Latin translation parallel to the Icelandic text This edition is cited in the dictionaries as "Symb" More recently we have the edition of Kristian Kálund in *Alfræði íslenskt* I (Copenhagen, 1908), 17-19, with his Danish translation of the same in *Aarbøger f nordisk Oplysning og Historie*, 3d ser, III (Copenhagen, 1913), 57-59, for the identification of places and monuments Kálund is much indebted to Werlauff and to Paul Riant, *Expéditions et Pèlerinages des Scandinaves en Terre Sainte au temps des Croisades* (Paris, 1865), pp 81-89 In the following notes I cite from Kálund's edition

For further details about Nikolás and his pilgrim-diary see Magoun, "The Rome of Two Northern Pilgrims Archbishop Sigeric of Canterbury and Abbot Nikolás of Munkaþverá," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIII, October 1940

<sup>2</sup> On the great monastery and the *borg* or Christian settlement, guarded against Saracen raids by a redoubt built by Pope John VIII in 880 and hence known as Iohannipolis (Giovannipolis), see Mariano Armellini, *Le*

that *Nikolás* is here using *borg* in just this sense (vs *borg* used for the "city" of Rome in the same sentence quoted above), cp Ital *borgo*, and *Borgo* as a district or "region" of Rome. The modern language would, I take it, prefer *útborg*, which in earlier times meant "outer-fortifications" of the like Werlauff's *cum arce* (p 23), i e "with a citadel" is probably not right here, nor is Kålund's *borg* (*Aarbøger* 58), for a Latin translation, *burgum*, or perhaps *suburbium*, would be the word, for Danish, certainly *Forstad*

## II *dagr* (*enn áttandi dagr Jóla*), "octave" (of Christmas)

The passage in Kålund (17, 27—18, 1) runs as follows: *þar skal páfi messo syngja enn vinn dag Jóla* "There (in S Lorenzo fuori) the pope must sing mass on the octave of Christmas (December 31st)" This is rightly translated into Latin (Werlauff 22 *octavo Natalitiorum die*)<sup>3</sup> and into Danish (*Aarbøger* 57 *ottende dag i jul*), in all dictionaries, however, especially English—Icelandic, the definition "octave" (of a Christian feast) should be entered (e g in Cleasby—Vigfússon under "*dagr*" 3 γ) since this is not only the orthodox but also the only possible modern English rendering of the ecclesiastical Latin *octava* (*dies*) or *in octavis* in this same sense (see *NED*, under "octave" sb., 1).

## III. *ker* n. (*gullker*), "(gold) reliquary"

The passage in Kålund (17, 23-4) runs as follows *ok margur aðrir helgur dómar varðir í einu gullkeri miclo* "and many other relics (are) preserved in a large gold reliquary." The renderings "golden vessel" of Cleasby—Vigfússon and "guldkar" of Egilsson—Jónsson will not do; for *ker* is here certainly used in the specifically ecclesiastical sense of reliquary (med Lat *reliquarium*, not Werlauff 22 *magno vase aureo*, nor *Aarbøger* 57 *glaskar*!). The modern language would, I suppose, render this by *gullskrin* n

## IV *nál* f. "obelisk"

The passage in Kålund (19, 4) runs *Péturs nál er há úti fyrir vestan* "St Peter's Obelisk is nearby outside to the west (of the *Chiese di Roma dal secolo IV al XIX* (2d ed, Rome, 1891), pp 930-31 and Christian Hulsen, *Le Chiese di Roma nel Medio Evo* (Florence, 1927), p 325, § 30

<sup>3</sup> *Dies* in the sense of a "fixed" or "set day" is preferably feminine



east-end of old St Peter's" The use of a word for "needle" (here *nál*) for "obelisk" is familiar in many languages and, applied to this very monument, is for example found in Tievisa's translation of Higden's *Polychronicon* "*seynte Peters nedle*" (*NED*, under "needle" sb, II 6 a, 1387) Both the Icelandic and Middle-English renderings reflect pilgrim translations of *Aguglia di s Pietro*, where *aguglia*, as in modern Italian, means "needle," also "obelisk" (along side of Ital *obelisco*) In Nikolás's day this obelisk, brought by Caligula from Helopolis in Lower Egypt and now located in the Piazza di s Pietro, was on the south side of the old basilica, just west of the round side-chapel of St Andrew, that is, pretty well up towards the west-end and hence "west" (*fyrir vestan*) of the main entrances at the east-end On this old location see Hans Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* (2nd ed, Berlin, 1927), p 175, 311 and Pl 13 f, and for the obelisk itself the *Enciclopedia italiana*, Vol xxv, Pl 15 facing p 100 The modern language must, I suppose, use (*egypzh*) *steinsúla*

#### V *umskurðr* m "prepuce"

The passage in Kålund (17, 22) runs *þar er umskurðr Christi* "there (in St John Lateian) is Christ's prepuce," the latter object being included in a list of relics Werlauff 22 *hic præputum Christi* has it right, in other words he understood *circumcisio* in the familiar med Lat concrete sense of "foreskin." *Aarbøger* 57 *dær er Christi omskæring* is, except to the cognoscenti, nonsense The modern language would doubtless here prefer *yfirhúð*, Danish *Forhud*

#### VI *blaungaz*?

The passage in Kålund (16, 3) runs *ok saurgaz hon (Tár á) allðri ne blaungaz* "and it (the Taro) is never polluted and is not roiled(?)" Werlauff 19 renders *blaungaz* by *miscetur*, Kålund in *Aarbøger* 57 by *blandes* This is all very likely right, but what is the verb *blaunga*? To suggest that we have here a palaeographic distortion of *blandaz* would, of course, be the sheerest guesswork. *Saurga* is, of course, a straightforward derivative from *saurigr* adj "filthy" "polluted."

F P MAGOUN, JR

*Harvard University*

GOTHIC *þis þiz-er, -uh, þis þiz-uh, anþaris anþanz-uh, etc*

Since the *-z-* in *þiz-er* does not correspond to North and West Gic. *-s* (ON *þes(s)*, OE *þæs*, OS *þes*, OHG *des*), Goth *þiz-* must be explained either as phonetically correct (< \**þezo*) or as due to the leveling of *-s-* (*þis* < \**þeso*) in favor of the phonetically correct medial *z* in the other forms of the paradigm

Van Helten<sup>1</sup> attempts to explain this discrepancy between Goth. *-z-* and North-West Gic. *-s* as due to a difference of accentuation in PGic, *-iz* < \**-esó* and *-es* < \**-éssó* with *s* from the dat. sing. ending \**-esmo*. The *-ss* in ON *þess* he considers as a survival of \**-esso*. The main objection to van Helten's hypothesis is that it separates the Gothic from the North-West Gic. in regard to *s z* which elsewhere is parallel in the pronominal forms. Furthermore, ON *þess* most likely represents a later analogical form,<sup>2</sup> since it is not in keeping with the corresponding forms with *-s* in West Gic.

Prokosch considers the *-s* in the Goth. simplex *þis*<sup>3</sup> as original (= North-West Gic. *-s*), but believes that in the compounds \**þiz-er, -uh* this *s* became *z* because the enclitic particles *-er -uh* originally bore the chief stress. Prokosch's theory does away with the main objection to van Helten's, but it is highly problematical whether the enclitic particles *-er -uh* originally bore the chief stress. Grk. *οὐροί* speaks for Prokosch's theory, but the derivation of *-uh* is still doubtful. If *-uh* goes back to \**-unh* (Lat. *quic-umque*) with zero grade of *ŋ* of the negative particle *ne*, this does not speak for an original stress upon *-uh*.

In view of these objections to the arguments in favor of Goth. *-z-* in *þiz-er* as phonetically correct I venture to advance the analogical argument.

I believe the analogy was not between *s z* alone but between *s z* as contained in the root syllable *þis- þiz-* which was identical in form except for *s. z*. The form, e. g., *þanz-ei* would have been less

<sup>1</sup> PBB 34, 105, Fussn 1, 36, 435 6, IF 26, 174 ff

<sup>2</sup> Van Helten (PBB 34, 105, Fussn 1) admits that the *-ss* in ON *þess* may be in part due to analogy "ss konnte hier z t auf nachbildung beruhen nach þeurrar etc neben þeurrar etc"

<sup>3</sup> A Comparative Germanic Grammar, Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia 1939 § 93, 3, p 269

<sup>4</sup> Op cit, § 79, 3, p 234

likely to influence *\*þis-er* because of the discrepancy between *þan-* and *þis-*.

In the following table of the simplex forms I assume Goth *þis* (< *\*þeso*) to be on a level with the corresponding North-West Gic. forms with *-s*.

*þis þiz-* (*-z* > *-r* in North-West Gic <sup>5</sup>)

A. *þis* (1) Gen. sing. masc-neut. Goth. *þis* = ON *þes(s)*, OE *þæs*, OS *thes*, OHG *des*.

B *þiz-* (1) Gen sing fem Goth *þiz-ōs* = ON *þeir-ar*, OE *þēr-e*, OS *ther-a*, OHG *der-a* (2) Dat. sing fem Goth *þiz-a* = ON *þeir-e*, OE *þēr-e*, OS *ther-u*, OHG *der-u* (3) Gen plur. masc-neut. Goth *þiz-ē* = ON *þeir-a*, OE *þār-a*, OS *ther-o*, OHG *der-o* (4) Gen plur. fem Goth *þiz-ō* = ON *þeir-a*, OE *þār-a*, OS *ther-o*, OHG *der-o*

There occurs in the Goth paradigm only *one* case of phonetically correct *þis* over against *four* cases of phonetically correct *þiz-*. Now, when the *-s* in *þis* became medial in the compounds *\*þis-er*, *-uh*, the *-s-* was leveled to *-z-* after the pattern of medial *z* which occurred everywhere else in the paradigm (1 e., *\*þis-er*, *-uh* > *þiz-er*, *-uh* after the pattern of *þiz-ōs*, *-ar*, *-ē*, *-ō* with or without the suffixes *-er*, *-uh*). The analogical *-z-* in *þiz-uh* was then transferred to the pronominal forms *hviz-uh*, *anþariz-uh*, etc.

The analogical argument has two points in its favor. (1) It preserves an originally parallel phonetic status of *s* *z* between Gothic and North-West Gic, (2) the leveling results in a uniform medial spirant in keeping with the uniform medial spirant *s* (*z*) in the nominal stems (cf. *agis-is*, *-a*, *riqiz-is*, *-a*) and in the verbal system (cf. *kusan*, *karis* *kusum*, *kusans*). The preservation of a uniform medial *s* *z* in the nominal *es/os*-stems is phonetically correct,<sup>5a</sup> but the example of a uniform medial spirant throughout the paradigm could lead to analogical leveling wherever the spirant was both voiced and unvoiced in the paradigm. In the verbal forms *kusum* · *kusans* the original *-s-* did not become *-z-* (according to Verner's Law) because the example <sup>6</sup> of *s* in the present and in the preterite singular system either prevented Verner's Law from operating or resulted in leveling its effect after it had operated. In

<sup>5</sup> The North-West Gic forms are put on a level with Gothic only insofar as *s* *z* (*r*) is concerned

<sup>5a</sup> Due to Thurneysen's law of dissimilation in unaccented syllables.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Prokosch, *op cit*, § 20, b, p 63

the pronominal *þis þiz*-forms Verner's Law had already operated, and a leveling of *s* to *z* in the pronominal system is no more surprising than the leveling of *z* to *s* in the verbal system

Against *\*þis-uh > þiz-uh* objection may be raised that an original *s* is otherwise always preserved<sup>7</sup> in medial position. But in such cases<sup>8</sup> there was no medial *z* in the paradigm, as in the case of *\*þis- þiz-ōs*, etc., whereby leveling of *s* to *z* could take place. If original *-z-* could through analogy vary with *-s-* (cf. *bryandz-up-þan*, Phil. 22 *bryands-up-þan*, Matth. vi, 7, with *-s* after the pattern of final *\*z > -s* in *bryands*), there is no reason why original *-s-* could not have been analogically displaced by *-z-* (*\*þis-uh > þiz-uh* after the pattern of the phonetically correct *þiz*-forms). In the latter case, leveling (in favor of *þiz-*) took place because elsewhere in the paradigm phonetically correct *þiz-* occurred. In the former case, *-z-* varied with *-s-* because the analogy was confined to the nom. sing. case *bryand-s(-z-)*.

The argument in favor of analogical leveling of *\*þis-er, -uh > þiz-er, -uh* does not disprove the phonetic theories, but it deserves a reconsideration, for it is in accord with a definitely established Goth. trend to preserve a uniform medial spirant throughout the paradigm, whereas the hypothesis (van Helten) *þis*<sup>9</sup> < *\*þezo* is a mere assumption in order to account for the *-z-* in *þiz-er, -uh* and at variance with North-West Gic. *-s*.

ALBERT MOREY STURTEVANT

University of Kansas

## A FOURTEENTH CENTURY SCRIBE

The degree to which Adam Scriveyne and his fellows may have warranted Chaucerian strictures on their "negligence and rape" is suggested by a passage in MS. Hm. 903 in the Huntington Library.<sup>1</sup> The scribe was copying the *Manuel des Pechiez*<sup>2</sup> and had written line 9541 when he reached the bottom of column two,

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Streitberg, *IF* 18, 392.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *was-uh wēsum, maguts-u maguts, suns-aw suns*.

<sup>9</sup> Scholars who consider the *-s* in *þis* as original (*þis* < *\*þeso*) are Kluge, *Urgerm.*, p. §235, Prokosch, *op. cit.*, p. 269. Streitberg (*Got. Elementarb.* 5-6, §114) evidently considers the *-s* as secondary (< *\*z*), for under the category "Got. *s* = *urgerm. z*" he places *anþaris anþariz-uh*.

<sup>1</sup> Formerly at Everingham Park, the manuscript was purchased for the

folio 52<sup>r</sup>. Line 9540 ends with "peche," and when he turned the leaf, his eye lit on another "peche" in the manuscript he was copying, seven lines above, at line 9535. He thus copied lines 9535-9541 twice. The differences are suggestive

	<i>Fol 52<sup>r</sup>, col 2</i>	<i>Fol 52<sup>v</sup>, col 1</i>
9535	de pechiez	dez pechez
9536	(omitted)	chatif (printed text has <i>h</i> )
9537	le regardait	lui regardoit
9538	Et        vait	E        veait
9539	le ad	lui aed
9540	fut	fust
9541	Lautre	Lautre

In addition to the omission, or the addition, of a word, an error which might occur anywhere, one might notice that in the course of seven lines the scribe employed spellings for nine words varying sufficiently so that many scholars would assume that the differences in spelling represented some difference in language. How much our scribe altered his copy, we cannot know, but he was so inconsistent in his practice that he wrote *de pechiez* and *dez pechez*, *le regardait* and *lui regardoit*, although he had the same copy for both versions, and presumably produced his two copies within a few minutes of each other. Surely such copying goes beyond "negligence", one wonders if it is what Chaucer called "rape". The scribe must have felt no compulsion to reproduce exactly what he saw before him, and unless he was mixing forms very indiscriminately, he was not substituting spellings which represented his own pronunciation for spellings which represented a different dialect in his copy.

Library in 1925. See Seymour de Ricci, *Census of the Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New York, 1935), I, 77, William H. Robinson, *Catalogue Number 12* (London, 1925), No 384, *First Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts* (London, 1874), p. 45b. It is a pleasure to acknowledge my indebtedness to the Library and to its officials, especially to Colonel R. B. Haselden, who had notes on the manuscript prepared for me when I was in Europe, and to Mr. H. C. Schultz, Curator of Manuscripts, who assisted me in difficult passages with the Library's ultra-violet equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Frederick J. Furnivall, Robert of Brunne's "*Handlyng Synne*," *A D 1303, with those Parts of the Anglo-French Treatise on which it was founded*, William of Wadington's "*Manuel des Pechiez*" (*EETS*, o s 119, 123, 1901-3), ———, *Robert of Brunne's Handlyng Synne with the French Treatise on which it is founded, le Manuel des Pechiez by William of Wadington* (London, 1862). I will cite the line numbering in the later edition.

The scribe cannot be excused on the ground that he was an inexperienced amateur. In the sixteenth century the manuscript was in the possession of St Mary's at York,<sup>3</sup> it had been executed in the fourteenth century, perhaps toward the middle, and during the first week of some August, fourteen shillings and eleven pence were paid for it.<sup>4</sup> We should assume from this fact that the book was copied by a professional scribe, and the appearance of the book itself corroborates the assumption. The hand is far from scrupulous, but it is even and clear. It changes but little throughout the manuscript, it appears to be the rapid, steady, somewhat careless hand of a practiced scribe doing a commercial and not very particular job. The pages have guide lines, but the scribe did not feel the need of ruling. There are simple initials, dashed with red and blue, and many pages have indications of the contents, often underlined in red. Marginal abbreviations indicate tales and the favorite monkish subjects. In short, the manuscript, as a piece of book-making, is apparently like thousands of others that emanated from commercial or monastic scriptoria.<sup>5</sup>

CHARLTON LAIRD

*University of Idaho, S B*

<sup>3</sup> An inscription on fol 1r reads, "liber monasterii beate marie Eboracensis emptus per fratrem Clementem Warthwyk qui Alienauit Anathema."

<sup>4</sup> An inscription on fol 67v reads as follows "ex pensis augusti prima septi mana xiiii s xj d"

<sup>5</sup> There are many erasures and corrections in the manuscript, but forunately these do not affect the repeated lines. There are also a number of notes in Latin, French, and English in later hands. One of these records a prayer in English that seems not previously to have been printed

God almyghtfull  
saue al rightfull  
Wys alle willefull  
help all nedfull  
Gladde alle sorufull  
haf mercy Of alle synnefull (fol 139v, col 2)

Captain Haselden estimates the script c 1425, a date which agrees with the apparent testimony of the language. I have re-aligned the verse as I suppose it should read, in HM 903 it appears as follows

God almyghtfull saue al rightfull  
Wys alle willefull help all nedfull  
Gladde alle sorufull haf mercy  
Of alle synnefull

A NOTE ON *SIR GAWAIN* 1795

The writer is at present busy with the task of preparing the glossary for an edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*<sup>1</sup> In that task he has owed much to the kindness and long-suffering of colleagues at his own and other universities<sup>2</sup> Having received so much kindness, it would seem incumbent upon him that every so often he should (quite literally speaking) 'unlock his word-hoard' for the benefit of other etymologists and the betterment of his own work. Hence this brief note.

Line 1795—I may bot mourne upon molde, as may þat much lovyes.

The word *may* (2nd *may* of the line) is generally rendered 'maiden, virgin' in ME literature (*NED*, s v *may* sb<sup>1</sup>) Derivation from OE poetic *mæg*, f, 'kinswoman' is probable (See H C Wyld, *Universal Dict*, N. Y., 1932)<sup>3</sup> *NED* notes that the word *Mæg* often occurs in OE with the sense 'woman,' and I believe the poet so uses it here Bercilak's lady is neither 'maiden' nor 'virgin'<sup>4</sup> His use of the word with this sense is some indication, even though slight, of the survival of the OE poetic vocabulary in the N. West Midlands, and hence of the vitality of the alliterative tradition in that region.

HENRY L SAVAGE

*Princeton University*

<sup>1</sup> Prof R J Menner of Yale, the editor of *Purity*, had at one time the intention of continuing his study of the unknown poet of the W Midlands by an edition of *Sir Gaw* He has very kindly turned over the material he has collected and prepared for that edition to the writer

<sup>2</sup> To the following I am particularly obliged and take occasion now to express 'anticipatory' thanks Professors E C Armstrong, H H Bender, A Elsassner of Princeton, F S Cawley of Harvard, Kemp Malone and S Einarsson of Johns Hopkins, Harold Whitehall of Wisconsin, Karl Young of Yale

<sup>3</sup> The most recent editors of *Sir Gawain* gloss *may* as 'woman,' but do not discuss the word

<sup>4</sup> The poet uses the word in *Pearl* 435 and 961 in the sense given in *NED* in one case to refer to the spotless purity of the Virgin, in the other to the unmarried innocence of the *Pearl* maiden—*yet* one is both Maid and Mother, and the other a bride of the Lamb

TWO NOTES ON *BEOWULF*1. *on stefn stigon* (l. 212)

No editor seems to have suggested that this phrase means essentially anything more than "went on board." However, in the light of our knowledge of the structure and use of early Scandinavian ships it seems more than likely that the poet meant not only that "the warriors went on board eagerly" (*Beornas gearwe on stefn stigon*), but that they took their places literally "in the prow," or "on the forecastle." Vessels of this period were equipped with raised decks at both the forward and after ends, the latter being the part of the ship where the commander and his helmsman had their stations, the former being occupied by a picked band of the ship's most trusted warriors (ON *stafn-búar*, "forecastle men"). This raised forecastle itself came to be called *Stefn*, the term not being reserved to the stem of the ship alone. Since the voyage here described was made under sail no men were needed at the rowing benches, and it is possible that an even larger number than otherwise stood *gearwe* on the ship's forecastle. See Joh Hoops ed., *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, Strassburg, 1911-1919, art. by W. Vogel "Schiff," pp. 112-3, and Eiríkr Magnússon, "Notes on Shipbuilding and Nautical Terms of Old in the North," *Saga Book of the Viking Club* (London, 1905), pp. 233-4.

2. *wudu bundenne* (l. 216)

*Bundenne* has heretofore been interpreted as merely meaning "joined," "well joined" or something similar, Schucking going so far as to suggest "eisengeschlagen." In view of the fact that *bundenne* stands alone and unqualified, it is almost certain that this word must apply to the "bound," i. e. "tied up" or "laced," structure known to have existed in North-Germanic and Scandinavian vessels during a period extending at least from the fourth to the tenth centuries. In this type of construction each plank of the ship's hull was worked from a thick piece of timber so that when it was whittled down to the correct thickness, at each frame-station two knobs, one above the other, were left projecting from the plank. These were drilled with holes that lay side by side with corresponding holes in the frame when the plank was bent to its



correct position, and through them linen cord, small tree roots, or some equally serviceable binding was passed in order to secure the planking to the frames. *Bundenne* seems only the most natural, perhaps inevitable epithet for a ship built in this manner.

It is further possible that *bundenstefna* (l 1910), which has so much puzzled the editors, may be best explained as meaning "laced prow" or, by synecdoche, "laced ship." See Magnússon, *op cit.*, pp 214-7, and Vogel, *art cit.*, pp 99, 103

H. LAMAR CROSBY, JR

Cambridge, Mass

---

## REVIEWS

---

*The Text of the Canterbury Tales* By JOHN M. MANLY and EDITH RICKERT. The University of Chicago Press, 1940 8 vols \$40 00.

The appearance in January of the present year of the Manly and Rickert *Text of the Canterbury Tales* was an event to which Chaucerians have looked forward for years with eager expectation. This enterprise, more extensive in its scope than any undertaken by American scholars since the appearance of Child's *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, was begun in 1924, and since then has engaged the larger share of the time and energies of Professors Manly and Rickert, with the assistance of a corps of trained collaborators. Miss Rickert died two years ago when the work was already nearing completion, having literally sacrificed her life to the task. It was a great source of satisfaction to Professor Manly's friends that he lived to reach the goal toward which he had strained his energies for fifteen years. But they were soon saddened by the news of his death on the second of April, only three months after the work issued from the press. The notable monument which Manly had reared to the honor of his beloved Chaucer thus becomes at the same time the monument to the author himself.<sup>1</sup>

Volume I is devoted to Descriptions of the Manuscripts. It was probably disappointing to Professor Manly that his exhaustive search through European libraries did not result in any addition

<sup>1</sup> It may not be out of place for the reviewer to state that when he undertook the task assigned to him he did not anticipate that it would be concluded with the somber note of a funeral tribute.

to the list of manuscripts previously known. The text of the early Merthyr fragment, the first page of which Manly reproduces in facsimile (I, facing p 361) was known to Sir William McCormick and collated by him in his *MSS of the Cant Tales* (p 548). However, Manly's thorough and detailed account of the MSS themselves, and his researches into their history and provenance, supply a rich storehouse of information. His descriptions cover a far wider range of topics than even recent Catalogues of Manuscripts, including not only Contents, Form, Collation, Date and Style of Writing, but also Ink, Supervision and Correcting, Illumination, Affiliations and Textual Character, Dialect and Spelling, and Special Features. However, in Volume I the lists of MSS contain some careless slips which do not recur in the subsequent volumes. Philipps 6570 is given as 6750 (pp xx and 415), Harley 2251 is given as 2551 (p xx), Trin Coll Camb R 3 3 is given as Trin Coll Camb R 33 (p xxi), and Trin Coll Oxf 49 is given as Trin Coll. Oxford Arch. 49 (p xxi). "Corpus Christi 198" (p xix) is listed without distinguishing the Oxford and Cambridge Colleges of this name.

In giving the contents of MSS, non-Chaucerian items are listed with commendable accuracy and completeness. The only omission in this respect which I have noted is in the case of Chetham Manchester 6709 (which Manly himself never saw—see I 9), where there is no mention of Lydgate's Prayer to St Edmund or his two Prayers against Pestilence. In his account of the Delamere MS Manly states "In it four spurious lines, found in no other MS, were written, including an appeal to St Thomas" (p 112), but in the account of Philipps 8136 we read "At the end of Th is a spurious quatrain alluding to St Thomas. It is in Bo<sup>1</sup> and D1, and was probably in Ha<sup>2</sup>" (p 423).

In tracing the history of a MS Manly has been at endless pains to identify persons whose names are written on the margins and on fly-leaves. As an illustration, taken almost at random, one may cite his inquiry into the genealogy and provenance of the Agarde family (I 45-47). Several names of this family, written in 16th-century hands, appear in BM Addit 35286, some of them recovered by the employment of ultra-violet rays. The identification of these personal names and the tracing of family genealogies, which really constitute separate pieces of research, add important information in regard to the hands through which the MSS passed in their descent to us.

In the examination of the MSS themselves, the valuable evidence to be gained by careful attention to seemingly unimportant details is brilliantly illustrated in the case of the Hengwrt MS, which on account of its vagaries in the order of the tales has long presented a perplexing problem. The importance of this MS has recently been stressed by Tatlock,<sup>2</sup> who expressed his belief that the Hengwrt

<sup>2</sup> *PMLA*, L, 133 ff

MS was written by the Ellesmere scribe and was of even earlier date. Manly, endorsing this conclusion, undertook a more minute and detailed examination of the MS and observed that in different portions at least three kinds of ink were used. By applying ultra-violet rays to the signatures in the MS he established the fact that quires 13-15 according to the present arrangement (including the text from the Monk's Prol to the Manciple's Prol and Tale) originally stood between quires 29 and 30 (i.e. between Melibeus and Parson's Tale), thus disposing of Tatlock's elaborate and ingenious attempt to account for the existing disarrangement in this MS (*PMLA*, L, 134-7) and confirming the opinion of Miss Hammond and Sir William McCormick (I 266-71). Manly observed further that "the make-up of the MS itself indicates at least two stages in its writing" (II 477). In the first stage the whole of Block D, the Nun's Priest's Tale and several links were lacking. "Later the scribe was able to supply most of the missing material. Perhaps the first [addition] was Block D," which is in an ink "distinctly lighter than that preceding and following" and is inserted in a unique position immediately after Block A. The other additions which "we may assume to have been added later" consist in "the three links of the E-F block, the Mk-NP link and NPT and McPT." "They are all in a bright yellow ink very different from any used elsewhere in the MS" (II 478).

Restoring the misplaced quires to their original position, we have the following as the order of tales in Hg.

ADB<sup>1</sup>F<sup>1</sup>E<sup>2</sup>F<sup>2</sup>G<sup>2</sup>E<sup>1</sup>CB<sup>2</sup>HI

This goes a long way toward correcting the disarrangement which has occasioned so much perplexity. In fact if we shift Block D (which was written later and mistakenly inserted before B<sup>1</sup>) and E<sup>1</sup> (Clerk's Tale) to the position between E<sup>2</sup> and F<sup>2</sup> the result would be complete agreement with the order of the tales in the numerous MSS of types *bd*\*. In both type *b* and type *d*\* the tales of the "marriage group" stand in the order E<sup>2</sup>DE<sup>1</sup>. And outside this "marriage group" there is no difference whatever between the order of *bd*\* and the restored order in Hg.

Though Manly and Tatlock agree in believing that Hg was earlier than Ellesmere and was copied by the same scribe, they differ widely in their estimate of the relative authority of these two MSS.

Although [says Manly] E1 has long been regarded by many scholars as the single MS of most authority, its total of unique variants, many of which are demonstrable errors, is approximately twice that of Hg. While it has a few lines not in any other MS, and shows some editorial changes that could have been made by Chaucer, it has many others that are questionable and some distinctly for the worse, even involving misunderstanding of the context. Since it is very clear that an intelligent person, who was certainly not Chaucer, worked over the text when E1 was copied, the unsupported readings of this MS must be scrutinized with the greatest care (I 150).

With this judgment, which from any other pen would have seemed positively irreverent, compare Tatlock's appreciation of the Ellesmere (*PMLA*, I, 129, and n 78)

Volume II, "Classification of the Manuscripts," with added chapters on The Order of Tales, and Early and Revised Versions, calls for more extended discussion, for it is this Volume which deals with the most controversial problems in Chaucer criticism. In the Introduction to his Classification Manly acknowledges that in the course of his studies his earlier opinions have been distinctly modified "When we began our work," he remarks, "we knew of the existence only of those variants with regard to which the evidence is clear. As others came to light, we had a difficult question to consider in view of the fact that in many of the tales the text is derived not from a single archetype but from texts which sometimes represent different stages of composition" (II. 39). And as he surveys the completed structure he admits that his classification "must produce so great an impression of complication and variability as to raise the question as to whether it can be correct" (II. 41).

Complicated it certainly is in comparison with the simpler scheme set forth by Manly in his 1928 edition of the CT, though complexity is not necessarily an evidence of improbability. This complexity, in Manly's opinion, is due chiefly to the fact that the extant MSS "do not go back to a single archetype derived from a completed MS of Chaucer's, with tales arranged, linked, and subjected to his corrections and changes, but rather to a body of incomplete material, in different stages of composition and only in part put in order and corrected" (II. 41).

Another cause of the existing complexity is manuscript contamination. In numerous instances scribes shift abruptly from an exemplar of one type to another. In the Merchant's Tale, for example, Manly recognizes three sections: Introduction (E 1245-1690), Tale (E 1691-2318), and Conclusion (E 2319-2418). These are distinguished by changes in the manuscript alignment. While this evidence of extensive contamination presents a vexing problem of classification, it is sometimes of value in throwing light on the development of the text. Manly protests against the opinion of scholars (if there are any such) who assume "that the CT MSS are all derived from a copy which Chaucer put into circulation shortly before his death" (II. 29) and argues that it is altogether reasonable "that Chaucer should have made more changes and additions than appear in the MSS that have come down to us. But the evidence for alterations in the text of CT is much more extensive than we are accustomed to think" (II. 38).

In view of this situation, however, one is moved to inquire why so many pages were devoted to the genealogical method in text criticism, since these processes "can result only in the establishment of the archetype where an archetype existed" (II. 40)—which certainly was not the case with the CT.

Having come to the conclusion that the text of the CT is not derived from a single archetype, the editors were called upon to decide, in Professor Manly's words, "whether we should treat all the variants as if derived from a single archetype or should attempt, before classifying, to distinguish the separate sources and deal with them separately" (II 39). This latter course, it was seen, presented manifest practical difficulties and for this reason was not attempted. "We have therefore proceeded," Manly continues, "as if all MSS. were from the same archetype, being on the watch, however, for indications of separate origin and separate lines of descent" (II 39).

I have dealt in some detail with the principles adopted as the basis of Manly's classification because they explain to some extent the contradictions and discrepancies in which he found himself involved through endeavoring to proceed "*as if all MSS were from the same archetype*" We are now prepared to consider his classification of the 82 extant MSS and two Caxton prints of the CT. Twenty-five of these MSS, which consist of small fragments or of one or two tales occurring separately, afford such slight evidence that they may be dismissed from consideration. On the basis of the fifty-seven which remain, Manly proceeds "to establish first of all the constant smaller groups, later to study the building up of the larger groups, and finally to deal with the MSS which show few if any affiliations with others" (II 21). By linking together pairs of very closely related MSS, and using the sigil of the earlier MS underlined to represent the small group to which it belongs (Thus  $Ad^3 = Ad^3-Ha^5$ ,  $Bo^1 = Bo^1-Ph^2$ ) he succeeds in consolidating the lists of MSS into less unwieldy form.

After thus reducing to single units these smaller groups consisting of two or three MSS he next attacks the problem of organizing the larger groups.

In his 1928 edition of the CT Manly declared: "The majority of the manuscripts point to two genuine types of arrangement" (p 78), but for his earlier Class I and Class II he now substitutes Groups *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d* (I 25). Nor, even in this four-fold grouping, are all the MSS included. "Besides the members of the four larger groups (*a*, *b*, *c*, *d*) there are a number of pairs of variable affiliations [twelve MSS in all]" (II 70). Moreover, group *a*, which might be taken to represent the earliest type, does not include the three earliest MSS (El, Hg, and  $Ha^4$ ) nor the two early fragments ( $Ad^4$ , Me). These Manly elevates to a superior rank *above* Group *a*. In his section on "The Ancestor of Group *a*" he remarks "It is textually clear that the group is not derived from the same immediate ancestor as El" (II 480).

Thus his classification of the groups presents a situation resembling the lineage of Melchisedek who was "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life." The fact that we do not have an original authentic

text of the CT from which to trace the line of development unquestionably presents the most serious difficulty in attempting to classify the MSS.

To the five MSS of group *a* (Cn, Ma, Dd, En<sup>1</sup>, Ds), in some tales "other MSS or groups attach themselves temporarily to *a* so closely that *a* does not appear without them . . . In some tales, Dd is either corrected or above Cn and En<sup>1</sup>, or (in Cl T) has changed affiliation . . . In other tales *a* represents such a good textual tradition that it shows few errors" (II 51).

Group *b*, consisting of three MSS (He, Ne, Tc<sup>2</sup>) and Cx<sup>1</sup>, might be expected to occupy a position next after group *a*, but apparently this is not the case, for we read

As to *b*, the variable behavior of its ancestor, which came into existence later probably than  $\sqrt{c}^*$  or  $\sqrt{d}$ , is accounted for by the fact that it was obviously made up in part from  $\sqrt{a}$ ,  $\sqrt{Gg}$ , and  $\sqrt{c}$  or  $\sqrt{cd}$ . Apparently it began with an *a* MS, and its general conception of order was that of *a* rather than of *cd* (II 43)

With this statement in regard to group *b* may be compared another (apparently penned by Miss Rickert) which appears on a later page

Chaucer scholars, including Manly, formerly regarded the *b*, *c*, and *d* arrangements as genetically related, but while the *d* pattern is derivable from the *c* pattern the differences between the *cd* arrangements and the *b* pattern suggest that the *b* order was independent of the other two (II. 485)

"Throughout CT," Manly observes, "Group *b* is associated with a variable number of irregular MSS which because of their continually fluctuating combinations cannot be assigned to any constant group. For this larger group in each tale the symbol *b*<sup>\*</sup> is used to designate all MSS associated with *b* in that particular tale" (II. 79).

"The members of Group *b* developed from a common ancestor, not by radiation, as did the two main subgroups of *a*, but by enchainment—the derivation from successive copies" (II. 57) This, however, can hardly mean that the *b* MSS were copied in turn from each other, for in the Pardoner's Tale He (the highest MS of this group) lacks the first three words of line 824 but Ne shows the line complete And in line 869-70 He reads "This poyson and into þe next unto man / As fast as evir that he myght be ran," whereas Ne differs notably "And swithe into the strete vnto a man / As faste as euer he might he ran"

"Group *c* includes Cp, La and Sl<sup>2</sup>, which in some tales are closely related and distinct from *d*, and in others are inseparable from *d*" (II. 62) "Of the three subgroups of the large composite group, *c* represents the earliest attempt to arrange the tales" (II.

\* The sign of the radical is placed over the literal designation of a group to indicate the ancestor of the group in question

42) This statement, as well as the one quoted above, that the ancestor of *b* "came into existence later probably than  $\sqrt{c}$  or  $\sqrt{d}$ ," suggests that the alphabetical designations were assigned to these groups before the collation of the MSS was completed.

The largest of the major groups, *d*, includes 13 MSS and "contains with more or less irregularity the subgroups *En*<sup>2</sup>, *Lc*, *Pw* (*Mm*-*Ph*<sup>3</sup>-*Pw*), *Ry*<sup>2</sup> and the single MSS *Dl*, *Ha*<sup>2</sup>, and *Sl*<sup>1</sup> . . . descended by the process of radiation from a common ancestor . . . Group *d* almost never exists, however, without other MSS temporarily closely affiliated. For this expanded or enlarged *d* the sigil *d*<sup>\*</sup> is used" (II 63). While the use of this sigil economizes space, it results in some inconvenience to the reader, especially as the MSS represented by *d*<sup>\*</sup> vary from one tale to another. It is stated that the MSS comprising *d*<sup>\*</sup> are listed for each tale, but this promise is not always fulfilled; for example, it is stated (II 264) that *Bo*<sup>1</sup> *Hk* are "the top MSS in *d*<sup>\*</sup>," but the list of *d*<sup>\*</sup> MSS given for the Clerk's Tale (III 328) does not include *Bo*<sup>1</sup> *Hk*.

In distinguishing the major groups of the CT MSS Manly appears to base his classification primarily on the order of the tales. "We may place many MSS," he says, "under one of four arrangements or patterns . . . *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, as follows" (I 25). In the tabulation which follows, group *a* might be supposed to represent the accepted order and *b*, *c* and *d* confusions of the Chaucerian tradition, but if this was at one time Manly's view clearly he ceased to hold it for in his later discussion he denies that Chaucer is responsible for any one of "the prevalent patterns of arrangements in the groups *a b c d*" (II 476). Elsewhere he objects that "some scholars [have] discussed the evolution of the CT as being represented by a succession of extant MSS, but it is clear that in such discussions only the single feature of the arrangements of the tales was borne in mind and the general characteristics and textual relations of the MSS were entirely neglected" (II 30). Little difference appears, however, between the method which he criticizes and the criterion which he employs in his own tabulation.

In undertaking to classify the MSS of the CT one must consider also the indications which are to be found in a number of the tales that Chaucer himself from time to time made extensive alterations of his text. "There are some passages," Manly remarks, "in which a small number of MSS have a reading which seems distinctly superior to the readings of the MSS in general, and many other passages where a group has inferior readings, some of which make upon the reader the impression not of scribal errors but of early unsatisfactory readings which were later improved by the original author" (II. 495). For, as Manly declares, "Chaucer's poetry is in the main of so fine a quality that it could not possibly have been produced in a single spontaneous outpouring, but must have been elaborated with critical and loving care before it attained the brilliancy and smoothness which characterize his best work" (II 501).

In noting individual instances of what are apparently author's alterations, Manly repeatedly observes that the unrevised, and therefore earlier, form of the text is found in MSS of type *d*. But he nowhere recognizes the significance of this evidence in its general bearing on the classification of the major groups. We proceed, therefore, to review the instances of these alterations, as assembled by Professor Manly and Miss Rickert, with particular attention to the situation presented in the *d*\* and associated MSS.

In the Knight's Tale at line 1906, where there is considerable variation in the MSS readings, Manly remarks

The simplest explanation of the confusion here seems to be that Chaucer originally wrote the line as it stands in *d*\*. Then in O<sup>2</sup>—perhaps to avoid hiatus—he stroked out 'side' and placed 'gate' in the margin for insertion before 'westward'. Most of the derivatives from O<sup>2</sup>, including Hg El, got the cancellation of 'side' but missed 'gate' (III 430).

In this Tale, as Miss Rickert shows, "Group *cd* separates at c. 1740, and thereafter Group *d* has along with many lines containing clear scribal errors, a good many readings that are inferior indeed to the corresponding lines in the standard text but do not seem like scribal variants" (II 496). After citing more than a score of such lines she concludes "The very number of such differences, together with their restriction to a limited portion of the text, points rather to revision by Chaucer than to a combination of purposeless editing and accident in the ancestor of *d*" (II 498). To this list two others may be added. In 2655-6 a large group of MSS (including *b*\*-*c*-*d*\*) read

He cryde hoo namoore for it is doon  
Ne non shal lenger to his felawe gon

Manly in discussing these lines suggests that "the couplet of the large group may represent Chaucer's first draft, and the form found in El Hg etc., may be his revision in O<sup>2</sup>. MS evidence is not decisive" (III 434). As to lines 2681-2 which are lacking in *Ad*<sup>8</sup> Dd El En<sup>3</sup> Gg Hg Hk Ps Py To, Manly remarks "If these lines were included in O<sup>1</sup>, they were apparently marked for omission, as they occur only in the *b*\*-*c*-*d*\* line of transmission" (III 434).

In the Canon's Yeoman's Prologue and Tale, "the variants in the text are some of them of such a nature as to suggest that they are not scribal variants but represent two different stages of Chaucer's own work" (II 498). Manly proceeds to illustrate by citing numerous lines "We may take Lc [a MS of group *d*] as representing the readings of the earlier text and El as representing those of the later" (II 499).

In the Physician's Tale the textual evidence suggests that this tale was first "written for a particular occasion antedating the CT period". He notes (II 326). "Apparently the Ph Endlink once consisted only of the 12 lines of D1<sup>1</sup> [a MS of group *d*]." These lines, however, did not connect PhT with PdT. "When Chaucer



decided to place PdT after PhT, he apparently first wrote a continuation of the comments on PhT (15 more lines) and then turned his attention to introducing PdT. Later he revised the whole link as thus written and produced the version found in El and most other MSS" (II 326-7). He concludes "The evidence for two versions is very clear in the Ph-Pd link" (II 498). The readings which Manly cites to illustrate the unrevised form in both the link and in the PhT are those which appear in group *d*.

"The internal revision" of the Clerk's Tale, as Manly observes, was "not very great, for Chaucer was translating from a definite text and attempting to render it into English as carefully as he could" (II 500). Nevertheless, he cites thirty lines "which may have belonged to this unrevised version." And, though he does not identify the MSS in which these unrevised readings occur, it is interesting to note that with hardly an exception, these readings are found only in *d* or *d*\* MSS.

In the Monk's Tale there were two separate versions differentiated by the readings in lines 3568 and 3616 and by the different position given to the Modern Instances. As Manly points out, "The change from 'bastard brother' in 3568 would seem to have been made in consequence of the reconciliation of the claimants to the throne of Spain effected by the marriage of Constance of Castile's daughter Katharine—Pedro's granddaughter—to Henri, the grandson of the bastard Henri of Trastemare. Negotiations for the reconciliation were begun by Juan, Henri's father, in the summer of 1386" (IV 511). The reading "bastard brother," which was evidently the earlier, is found in the large *Ha*<sup>4</sup>-*cd*<sup>4</sup> group, and all these MSS agree also in placing the Modern Instances within the tale instead of at the end. Here again the MSS of group *d*, supported in this case by *Ha*<sup>4</sup> and group *c*, represent the earlier tradition.

Our examination of these minor textual details has brought out the significant fact that where differences exist which seem to represent revision by Chaucer himself, the MSS of the *d* group almost without exception follow the unrevised and therefore the earlier form of the text. Let us now turn to certain other passages listed by Manly, some of which afford evidence of structural alterations.

The Man of Law's Endlink (B1163-90) is contained in 35 MSS. "That the passage was written by Chaucer," says Manly, "is self evident" (III. 453). "The link . . . clearly belongs to an early stage in the composition of CT. When Melibeus was transferred to Chaucer himself and the Summoner involved in the quarrel with the Friar, this endlink ceased to have any proper function and became a mere vestigial organ, a sort of literary vermiform appendix" (II 189-90). Be this as it may the matter which concerns us at present is that this early link is found in nearly all the *b*\* *c* and *d*\* MSS, but is lacking in *a* *Ad*<sup>3</sup> *Bo*<sup>1</sup> *Bo*<sup>2</sup> *Ch* *El* *En*<sup>3</sup> *Gg* *Hg* *Hk* *Ps* and *To*.

In the Wife of Bath's Prologue are five short passages (44<sup>a-f</sup>,

575-84, 609-12, 619-26, 717-20) which occur only in manuscripts of the *a* and *b* types and in a few irregular MSS. In regard to these passages Manly concludes

The most reasonable hypothesis is that they were later insertions by Chaucer himself in a single MS, from which they were obtained by the ancestor of the *ab*\* group. No MS outside of this group has all the passages, some have picked up four of them, others only three, one has merely a marginal indication for the insertion of one of the later passages (III 454)

In the Somnour's Tale the large *d*\* group is split into two divisions. Seven of the twelve MSS of the first division end the tale at line 2158 (Pw Ph<sup>3</sup> Ra<sup>2</sup> Sl<sup>1</sup> Hk Ry<sup>2</sup>) adding four spurious lines. The other five have picked up the final episode from other MSS. These two divisions of the *d*\* group are further distinguished in the body of the tale by clear textual differences: whereas *d*\*<sup>1</sup> is wholly distinct from the text of group *c*, *d*\*<sup>2</sup> follows the readings of this group. "It is, then," concludes Manly, "impossible to doubt that  $\sqrt{d^{*1}}$  was without D2159-2294, the final episode of the tale. There are two possible explanations: either  $\sqrt{d^{*1}}$  had lost two folios (136 lines) or *d*\*<sup>1</sup> represents an earlier and unfinished form of SuT" (II. 229). The latter explanation is the one favored by Manly.

In the Clerk's Tale and Envoy we have perhaps the clearest instance of structural revision by Chaucer himself. The Wife of Bath stanza (1170-1176) "is lacking in the twenty-four MSS which form Group *d*\*. These MSS not only lack all reference to the Wife of Bath but also those having the Envoy arrange the last three stanzas so as to end with line 1200" (III 473).

Furthermore "these MSS, except Tc<sup>2</sup> and To, lack E 1213-44, the Cl-Me Link, which was apparently not written until after the order of lines at the end of the Envoy had been changed" (II 243). "The next stage would be that exhibited in MSS of the *b* and *c* groups, which have the WB stanza and the lines of the Envoy in the usual order. Still later would come the binding of ClT and MeT together by the link (E 1213-44) echoing E 1212" (II 244). But group *b*, oddly enough, though preserving the order of the tales in group *d*\* (E<sup>2</sup>DE<sup>1</sup>), also shows the link (E 1213-44) which Manly assigns to the latest stage. With reference to this Cl-Me link (E 1213-44) Manly offers a further explanation: "The compiler of the ancestor of the *c* and *d* groups apparently did not get hold of these lines when he was making up his copy of CT" (III 473). But how could the compiler get hold of a link which was not composed until later? <sup>4</sup> For our present purpose it is sufficient to observe that in the Clerk's Tale group *d*\* again represents an earlier form of the text—whether, as Manly seems to imply (II.

<sup>4</sup> On the late date of this Cl-Me link see further II 266

499-500), the text in this form "was a pre-CT composition" we are not called upon to decide.

There remain to be considered briefly two other instances of author's alterations, in which the evidence points to the same conclusion, although in these cases the situation is somewhat less obvious. The Monk-Nun's Priest's Link exists in two forms a long form of 54 lines and a short form of 34 lines (omitting B 3961-80). The shorter of these is regarded as the original and the longer as a later expansion. On the basis of the general grouping of the MSS Manly arrives at the opinion "that originally the short form with 'Knyght' in 3957 appeared in the ancestor of  $b^1$ - $c$ - $d^*$  and in Hg" (iv. 513-4). Thus, it will be noted, the  $d^*$  group again ranges itself with those which preserve the earlier state of the text.

The final case to be considered is that of the Nun's Priest's Endlink (B 4637-52). This is preserved in only nine MSS—the five of group  $a$  (Cn Ma Dd En<sup>1</sup> Ds) and Ch, En<sup>2</sup> Ad<sup>1</sup> and Ry<sup>1</sup>. Judging this case according to all the others which have been considered one would have little hesitation in concluding that since the Endlink is lacking in MSS which ordinarily give us the unrevised form of the text it probably represents a late addition by Chaucer. But in this instance Manly reverses the evidence and decides that the NP Endlink was "Cancelled by Chaucer and originally obtained only by the ancestor of the  $a$  group" (ii. 39).

Taken as a whole, the textual evidence which we have considered seems to show conclusively that group  $d$  often represents the unrevised (and therefore the earlier) form of the text, rather than a late and degenerate stage. One may concede freely that the MSS of group  $d$  compare unfavorably with Hg, El, and group  $a$  on the score of scribal accuracy and still regard them as deriving from an earlier textual tradition.

Our conclusions from this textual evidence, though not based in any respect upon "the arrangement of the tales," have a direct and important bearing on this question. The problem of the order of the tales is one in regard to which both Manly and Tatlock express themselves emphatically. "Not only," declares Manly, "are the prevalent patterns of arrangements in the groups  $a$   $b$   $c$   $d$  not the work of Chaucer, there is not a single MS or small group the order of which can be ascribed to him" (ii. 476). The arrangements of the tales in the existing MSS no doubt present inconsistencies, but this is not surprising when one considers that in these MSS both the earlier and later stages of Chaucer's work are represented. For, as Tatlock truly observes, Chaucer "is very unlikely to have left a unified and arranged copy [of the C T]." This, however, is far from justifying him in his sweeping conclusion. "None of the MSS, however good, has any authority whatever in determining the order of the groups" (*PMLA*, I. 131).

There is abundant evidence that Chaucer himself, besides making extensive revision in the text of his tales, also shifted their order.

One need only refer to the Man of Law's head-link with its promise of a prose tale, and to the Shipman's tale in which the pronouns betray the fact that it was composed for a woman. Such repeated shifts in Chaucer's plan could hardly fail to result in some perplexity and confusion on the part of the scribes.

Returning now to our consideration of group *d*, it is to be observed that this group, which in numerous instances preserves the earlier textual tradition, likewise shows some notable variations from the standard text in the order of the tales which may represent an earlier stage in Chaucer's plan.

In 23 MSS (among them the very early Hg) the Squire's tale is followed by the Merchant's, with the clumsy substitution of "Marchand certeyn" for "Frankeleyn" in the genuine Squire-Franklin link. This arrangement, however, seems to be directly connected with Chaucer's earlier order of the tales in the Marriage Group (still preserved in 20 MSS: type *d* 13, type *b* 6, anomalous 1) according to which the Merchant preceded the Wife of Bath instead of following the Clerk.<sup>5</sup> Some scribe and not Chaucer, of course, was responsible for inserting the Marriage Group after the incomplete Squire's tale, and for altering the link. More noteworthy still, in 32 MSS (type *d* 16, type *b* 11, type *c* 3, anomalous 2) the Squire's tale follows the Man of Law's.

It seems not unreasonable, then, to suppose that the order of the tales in group *d* is based upon an earlier arrangement which Chaucer later discarded, though undoubtedly it has suffered some tinkering at the hands of scribes, who patched out some of the remaining gaps with spurious links. This assumption, at all events, is less arbitrary than the sweeping denial of any authority whatever to the MSS.

Is there no significance, for example, in the fact that in the MSS of group *d* (supported in this instance by groups *b* and *c*) the Man of Law's tale is followed by the Squire's and is, moreover, securely bound to it by a link which Manly and scholars generally accept as genuine? It would be inappropriate to digress in a review to consider in detail the problem of the Man of Law's Endlink. It may be noted that Manly, though still insisting that in these lines it was not the Squire who interrupted the Parson, no longer regards either the Shipman or the Somnour as possible for this rôle. But his final suggestion in regard to this link—"It might have been intended for use at a later time in connection with some tale which Chaucer did not live to write" (II. 492)—proposes what is in every way a desperate solution, not only because it seems very unlikely that Chaucer would compose a link in advance of the tale which it was designed to introduce, but also because even this hypothesis

<sup>5</sup> Elsewhere I have offered what seems a reasonable explanation of the shift in the position of the Merchant's Tale (see *PMLA*, XLVII, 1042, and 1055 ff.)

leaves unexplained the appearance of the Squire's name in this link in an overwhelming majority of the MSS

An interesting question, on which Manly throws some additional light, is that concerning the circulation of the *Tales* before Chaucer's death Tatlock in his article on "The Canterbury Tales in 1400" affirmed that "Chaucer especially was unlikely to publish, frequently betraying, as we have seen, solicitude for the purity of his text and his literary reputation" (*PMLA*, L 105). After rejecting *in toto* the notion that Chaucer himself "ever published this work as a whole in any form," he continues

To any publication in large parts, or in 'groups,' much of the same considerations applies, few or none of these are not in need of some revision, no 'group' except the first is self explanatory I know of no evidence in the MSS favoring the idea Against publication by Chaucer of single tales or long prologs there is less probability, but no positive proof of it is known

In regard to this matter Manly expresses himself much more cautiously

That at Chaucer's death more than one copy of some of the tales may have been in the hands of some of his friends seems not improbable Some of the tales indeed contain passages which strongly suggest that they were written for particular occasions and presented on those occasions to particular audiences And we may feel reasonably sure that Chaucer discussed his literary work with some of his friends and made them sharers of his pleasure in what he had written by allowing them to make copies of some of his tales These single copies we believe were made use of by the scribes who after Chaucer's death attempted to assemble the parts of the unshaped C T (II 36 37)

Elsewhere we find Manly advancing this opinion more positively "The textual differences," he remarks, "seem most easily explained by the supposition that some of the editors began with assembling tales which were already in circulation—that is to say, in the hands of Chaucer's more or less intimate friends" (II 489). Even more significant are his repeated references, in the course of his MS descriptions, to the picking up of "blocks" (i e groups) of tales from separate sources In his account of Corpus (a c MS which he dates "1410-20") he states "As the links introducing MeT, SqT, and FkT were all inaccessible to the maker of  $\sqrt{c}$ , and as he had *these tales in separate booklets* [*italics mine*], he was able to place them where he thought fit" (I 95) In the ML Endlink the scribe, Manly supposes, even if he found the reading Somnour at 1179 "would probably regard that as a scribal error for 'Squyer,' as the Summoner was already placed, after the Friar" This explanation, it will be noted, implies the existence of Block D in which the Somnour's Tale is included. Again in outlining the process of extending the very early Hengwrt MS to its present form Manly notes that in its first stage the scribe "lacked the whole of Block D," the NP Prol and Tale and Block H (II. 477). This recognition that

in the year 1400 detached Blocks of the CT were already in circulation is difficult to distinguish from the fascicule theory held by Miss Hammond and Brusendorf but emphatically rejected by Tatlock (*PMLA*, L 105 note 15).

One recalls also the Monk's Tale, in which, as Manly shows, Chaucer altered the offending "bastard brother" line, probably not long after the political reconciliation effected in 1386. How does it happen, one asks, that in this line the numerous MSS of the  $Ha^4 cd^*$  group preserve the unrevised reading unless they were copied from MSS circulating in Chaucer's life-time?

Manly begins his Chapter, "The Order of Tales," by remarking: "Some scholars have attempted to establish a few typical arrangements as having been made by Chaucer and to derive one of these from another. Inasmuch as the evidence of the MSS seems to show clearly that Chaucer was not responsible for any of the extant arrangements, there is no reason to discuss the arguments of previous scholars as to his reasons for changes" (II 475).

But the manifest confusion which scribes have introduced into the MSS should not close our eyes to the very significant agreement in the order of the tales which is exhibited in types *b*, *c*, and *d*

<i>b</i>	A	B <sup>1</sup>	F <sup>1</sup>	E <sup>2</sup>	D	E <sup>1</sup>	F <sup>2</sup>	G	C	B <sup>2</sup>	H	I	
<i>c</i>	A	X	B <sup>1</sup>	F <sup>1</sup>		D	E	F <sup>2</sup>	G	C	B <sup>2</sup>	H	I
<i>d</i>	A	X	B <sup>1</sup>	F <sup>1</sup>	E <sup>2</sup>	D	E <sup>1</sup>	F <sup>2</sup>	G	C	B <sup>2</sup>	H	I

That Group A with the General Prologue should be placed first was of course inevitable. But this is the only Group, as Tatlock remarks, which is "self-explanatory." That the others should be ranged in the same order, with only trifling deviations, is truly remarkable if single tales were picked up at random by individual scribes. The *b*, *c*, *d* types, as we have seen, represent in general the unrevised (and therefore the earlier) form of Chaucer's text. And the error in the position of Group G is quite intelligible when one notes that G<sup>1</sup> (the Second Nun's tale) did not contain any topographical indication of its place in the Series. It was not therefore until G<sup>2</sup> (Canon's Yeoman's T) was added that the position of the Group after B<sup>2</sup> was established. Just when Chaucer added the Canon's Yeoman's Tale we cannot say, but Manly declares "It is universally admitted that this is one of the latest pieces of writing in CT" (iv. 521). And this tale is missing in no less than seven MSS, notably exceeding the record of omissions in any other tale.

The noteworthy agreement of the MSS of types *b*, *c* and *d* in the arrangement of the tales certainly suggests that it was based upon some tradition which existed even before the revised form of the text. And it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this tradition antedated the death of Chaucer.

Manly has pursued textual investigation of the extant MSS to its utmost limit. None of the extant MSS, however, was made under the author's direction. Moreover, though it is agreed that Chaucer made extensive alterations in the course of his work, the

earlier drafts whose existence we assume have not been preserved. Consequently these must continue to be matters of inference which lie outside the province of textual investigation.

Volumes III and IV consist of the Text of the *Canterbury Tales* with Critical Notes and a valuable discussion of the manuscript glosses (III 483-527). Manly voices his protest against procrustean methods of dealing with Chaucer's versification: "Certainly lines of trochaic movement, lacking the unstressed syllable of the first foot, are far more numerous in the MSS than any earlier editor has admitted" (II 40).<sup>6</sup> In establishing his own text he has not been governed by dogmatic metrical standards but by the evidence which the MSS present. In the first line of the General Prologue he gives an example of his independence of tradition by dropping the final *e* from "Aprill" despite the fact that this leaves us with a headless line. For this relief much thanks! Intelligent readers (and Manly's text is evidently not designed for others) will not be inconvenienced by the fact that the text is not provided with punctuation. Indeed, the reader who is familiar with the fourteenth-century idiom will probably prefer to rely on his own construction of the lines instead of following the guidance of editorial punctuation. Taking the Man of Law's tale as a sample, one notes that Manly's readings usually agree with those of Robinson's text rather than with those of the Oxford Chaucer. Where differences appear it will usually be found that Manly breaks away from the authority of the Ellesmere MS, presumably through preference for the readings of Hengwrt. Examples of this are: But *for* And 150, And *for* That 188, O *for* On 466, in the desert *for* in desert 501, nast *for* hast 631, I holde *for* holde I 676, noon oother bityde *for* no bet bitide 714, tath *for* taketh 728, of al *for* to al 735, his lettre *for* eek his lettre 882, was *for* nas 938, thogh *for* althogh 973, swowneth *for* swowned 1058, holy *for* in holy 1156.

It must be said, however, that for the most part Manly leaves it to the reader to find out by a process of elimination what is his authority for a given reading. In the notes at the foot of the page he occasionally quotes the MS (or MSS) which support his reading—but he does this only occasionally. And in the Corpus of Variants he cites only variant readings—thus recording in full the MS evidence *against* his reading but not that which he is following. His citations, so far as I have checked them, are free from errors.<sup>7</sup> The text follows the Ellesmere order of the groups but retains the Oxford Chaucer's designation of the groups by letters, with a resultant alphabetical confusion in the arrangement: A B<sup>1</sup> D E F C B<sup>2</sup> G H I. Moreover, the line-numbering of the Oxford Chaucer

<sup>6</sup> See also his note on Prol 217 (III 423).

<sup>7</sup> This observation may be extended to a general commendation of the proof-reading throughout these volumes. Such a typographical error as in the Volume No XLVIII instead of XXVIII in the top line of II 36 is an isolated exception.

is preserved. As a result B 1190 stands in vol. III, p. 231, and B 1191 in Vol. IV, p. 109.

The Critical Notes appended in Vols. III and IV—slightly over a hundred pages—are confined almost wholly to textual matters. These Notes traverse to a considerable extent critical problems also dealt with in Vol. II under Classification, Order of Tales or Early and Revised Versions. There is also some duplication of information presented in the Descriptions of MSS in Vol. I and to a less extent of that supplied in the Corpus of Variants (Vols. V-VIII). Consequently the reader who seeks information on a particular question is in many cases under the necessity of searching for it in several places. But at all events he has reasonable assurance that his search will be rewarded.

And if he haue nat seyde hem leue brother  
In o book he hath seyde hem in another

Volumes V-VIII—one half of the entire work—are devoted to the Corpus of Variants. In these volumes Manly records the variant readings presented in all the 82 extant MSS and fragments (the textually worthless description of the Parson in Ad<sup>4</sup> is printed *en bloc*, v. 42-43). This prodigious task was simplified by the ingenious system of line-by-line collation on cards, which Manly explains in detail in II 1-9. This system also provides a means of checking the readings and thereby virtually eliminates the possibility of error. Without the employment of some such system the compilation of this Corpus of Variants would have been impossible.

The casual reader of Chaucer, it is safe to say, will pass these four volumes by with a shudder. But one who wishes to get the complete MS evidence in the case of a particular line or phrase will be grateful to find here the exact data which he requires.

Within the limits of a review it is impossible to discuss all of the separate essays which have been included in this *magnum opus*. But special attention should be called to Margaret Rickert's valuable study of Illumination in the Chaucer MSS (I 561-605). The text of her study is illustrated by facsimiles from the MSS themselves.

CARLETON BROWN

New York University

Edmond—Puzi—Michel, *les Prénoms de Trois Enfants*. Par  
ANTOINE GRÉGOIRE. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres;  
Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1939. Pp. 188.

Ce livre contient trois études sur des formations linguistiques faites spontanément par les mères de trois enfants à propos de leurs prénoms et observées attentivement à l'insu des mères, par des



pères avertis et qui ont dû, entre parenthèses, "y prendre un plaisir extrême" Ces mères avaient en effet, à des degrés divers, le don de créer des appellations nouvelles et variées en présence des nouvelles formes d'activité de leurs enfants et des différents événements du milieu familial où se déroulait leur enfance

Ces études sont intéressantes et instructives écrites avec une sympathie souriante où perce un brin d'humour, elles n'en sont pas moins des rapports scientifiques exacts L'importance de leurs résultats consiste en ce qu'elles nous font assister à des actes de création linguistique authentique dans des conditions bien définies On y trouve souvent la confirmation de lois générales connues mais qui s'éclaircissent d'un jour nouveau

Ainsi l'une d'elles, la mère d'Edmond, a tiré du nom du bébé d'abord *Monmon*, puis *Ponpon*, nullement, observe l'auteur et je le crois, sous l'influence du nom commun *pompon* Ceci est curieux et montre à quel point la sémantique l'emporte sur la phonétique dans les associations d'idées ceci explique aussi que le jeu de mots fasse rire par la surprise causée par la perception d'un rapport phonétique habituellement ignoré La mère d'Edmond a ensuite créé toute une série de diminutifs *Monmonnet*, *Monmignonnet*, *Monmignonnette*, *Monmonnette*, *Monnette*, etc, et chaque innovation est placée dans son milieu circonstanciel L'observateur analyse ou interprète l'attitude, l'état d'âme de la mère dans l'acte de création; le tâtonnement et l'échec possible de l'innovation et sa rapide élimination par exemple *Monmonnesse* pas très adapté à un garçon! On remarquera que toutes ces innovations ont laissé intacte la syllabe principale du nom *Mon*

Par contre, le deuxième enfant *Puxi*, le fils de M Spitzer, a reçu de sa mère, trois mois après sa naissance, le surnom de *Puckchen*, diminutif de *Puck* (cf. *Puck* de Shakespeare), car son prénom officiel, Wolfgang (de Wolfgang Goethe) ne semblait pas, instinctivement, à la mère, correspondre au petit bonhomme Puis suivit une série de diminutifs, *Pucks*, *Puxi*, etc Bientôt cependant, à l'occasion du don, fait à la mère, d'une gravure portant le titre de *Tudelut*, elle appellera le bébé *Tudelutchen*<sup>1</sup>—plus tard un livre lu par elle produira pour l'enfant le surnom de *Kabauschen*, à l'occasion d'un article qui l'avait intéressée elle lui donnera les surnoms de *Tchnudelbutzchen*, *Schnultzchen*, etc Cette mère, active innovatrice, aura rattaché son enfant, par ces surnoms successifs, aux impressions multiples différentes éveillées en elle par des événements intérieurs d'origine diverse

Le troisième cas, celui de Michel, est le plus étudié il remplit en effet la plus grande partie du livre (pp 50-167). La mère d'origine méridionale française, mariée à un Belge, l'Edmond de la première partie de ces études, vivant plus ou moins à l'écart et

<sup>1</sup> Innovation facilitée peut-être par la succession d'*us* qui arrondissent les livres comme pour un baiser.

isolée dans la banlieue de Bruxelles, s'est consacrée presque exclusivement à son enfant. En l'espace de trente mois elle lui a donné près d'un millier de noms différents, se dédommageant ainsi, semble-t-il, de la perte de son soleil provençal. Du point de vue psychologique, il y a là évidemment le phénomène remarquable d'une sorte de production intense sous pression. Toutefois, il y aurait lieu de distinguer entre des appellations de circonstance assez ordinaires et d'autres plus intéressantes linguistiquement. Lorsqu'elle appelait son bébé *Monsieur de la Fontaine*, avec variations telles que *Fontaine de Jouvence*, par une allusion facile à comprendre, il n'y a pas entre cette mère et les autres, beaucoup de différence. Bien des enfants ont été appelés *Cassetout*, *Cassepot*, après avoir cassé quelque objet, etc. Ce qui caractériserait ici la mère de Michel serait peut-être un recours plus grand fait aux souvenirs savants, littéraires, ou de simples lectures. Par exemple, l'appellation imagée toute naturelle de *Petit Poussin* lui suggérerait *Nicolas* (cf. *Nicolas Poussin*), ou bien, *petite rosse* (?), *Rossini*.

Mais où elle se montre décidément originale, à mon avis, c'est dans l'emploi intarissable de diminutifs s'accrochant à toutes sortes de mots *grinchonot*, *grinchonu*, *grinchonette*, *grinchonichonette*, *ma toute belle*, *ma toute bellonette*, *ma toute belline*, *ma toute bellichonette*. Alice (puisque'il faut l'appeler par son nom) en a employé 494, vingt-huit de plus que n'en avait mentionné Nyrop. Le gros de ces créations correspond à des périodes d'exubérance celle des trois premiers mois qui ont suivi la naissance, et surtout le troisième mois où la santé de l'enfant bien affermie a complètement rassuré la mère.

Ces phénomènes n'ont pas intéressé que les linguistes. Les écrivains qui ont aimé les enfants ont contemplé avec attendrissement ce jaillissement d'appellations où se divertit et s'épanche le cœur maternel. L'auteur cite V. Hugo (*Les Misérables*, IV, I)

La petite se nommait Euphrasie. Mais d'Euphrasie la mère avait fait *Cosette* par ce doux et gracieux instinct des mères et du peuple qui change Josépha en Pepita et Françoise en Sillette. Nous avons connu une grand'mère qui avait réussi à faire de Théodore *Gnon*.

Il cite aussi M. Duhamel (*Les plaisirs et les jeux* I, VII) qui parle d'un prénom Jean, devenu *Zazou*, puis *Troup*, *Zaprou*, *Dabrou* et en définitive *Babou*. Ce sont là, si je puis dire, des évolutions organiques on imagine, en effet, facilement le prénom *Jean* prononcé d'une façon enfantine *Za*—puis par répétition de la consonne et additions du suffixe hypocoristique "*ou*" (loulou, chou-chou) *Zazou*, etc. Le témoignage de ces écrivains a de la valeur. Il serait bon d'en faire un relevé systématique pour les différentes périodes.

En résumé ces études suivies (en appendice) des notes de plusieurs autres observateurs ont un intérêt à la fois psychologique et linguistique. Admettons que nous savions, ou du moins, que nous

supposons que toute innovation linguistique est un phénomène individuel, ces observations nous en apportent une preuve considérable. De même si nous sentions que ces innovations sont de caractères, d'espèces bien différentes suivant les personnes innovatrices et les conditions dans lesquelles elles se réalisent, nous le voyons ici manifestement. Il est probable que d'études similaires multipliées se dégagerait, entre autres, une connaissance plus précise, plus intime du processus de la création linguistique, de sa variété, de sa souplesse, de ses heureuses réussites et aussi des résistances qu'elle rencontre dans le groupe social. Ce dernier point n'a pas été ou à peine considéré dans le livre de M. Grégoire. Je crois cependant qu'il a son importance.

HENRI F. MULLER

*Columbia University*

"*Anseys de Mes* according to Ms. N (Bibl. de l'Arsenal 3143), text, published for the first time in its entirety, with an Introduction" (Columbia University diss.) By HERMAN J. GREEN. Paris: Les belles lettres, 1939. Pp. 459.

De cette publication d'un texte long de presque 14600 vers, hérissé de difficultés, et qui a dû coûter beaucoup d'efforts à l'éditeur laborieux, je ne me sens compétent de juger qu'au point de vue linguistique, et, de ce point de vue exclusif, je ne puis malheureusement dire trop de bien. Une lecture rapide, au petit bonheur, particulièrement des notes et du lexique, m'a révélé beaucoup de bévues. Mon premier regard a été attiré par la note au v. 2959: "*fleere*—historical infinitive! This word, which obviously is derived from the Latin *flere*, does not appear in Godefroy." Le passage en question se trouve dans la scène de l'enterrement de beaucoup de "vassaux" dans le moultier de Saint-Seurin. Les corps ont été portés au moultier

2959  
 Devant aus font porter mainz estaval  
 Et mainte crois dont sont d'or l'enseignal  
 Li ensenz *fleere* et amont et aval  
 Toute la nuit dusque chantent li gal,  
 Que ce leverent li moine natural  
 Por enfoir les cors de tant vassal

On se demande comment un infinitif historique (sans la prép. *a ni de*!) d'un verbe inconnu dans toute la Romania et abandonné par le latin vulgaire (v. Loeferstedt, *Philolog. Komm.* p. 320), sans évolution de *ē* → *o*, pourrait se trouver dans un texte a. fr. du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Et qu'ont à faire dans cette scène macabre des enfants? Lire. *li ensenz fleere* = "l'encens embaume" (*flavere* intransitif au sens de "exhaler de bonnes odeurs" est attesté par le

FEW à partir du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle) De même j'étais frappé par la note au v 11282 "au maille—neg. expression there was nothing at all left when he was through"—mais *maille* (soit de *macula*, soit de *medialia-metallica*) est du féminin! Il s'agit d'une ville autrefois riche, maintenant dévastée

Et Berengiers a la cite saisie,  
De toute au maille, n'i a remés demie

Même dans la théorie de l'auteur, on ne comprend pas *demie* Lire: *de toute aumaille n'i a remes demie* 'pas la moitié d'une pièce de bétail n'y est restée'

Au v 6248 l'auteur lit *Sire, ale m'ant, Je vos comment a Dieu omnipotent* avec un subjonctif inattesté, pour ne pas accepter *Sire Aleinant* dit à un Flamand Mais au v 4829 des messagers sont envoyés par *Alemaigne duques a Saint Quentin* et voir sur la confusion d' 'Allemand' et 'Flamand' *Neuphil Mitt* 1936, p 98—Au glossaire on lit "aposée—betrothed, wife, may connote idea of marriage contract or possibly idea of putting hands on bride as token of possession"—mais toute cette pseudo-etymologie symbolisante (*apponere manus*?) s'évanouit si nous considérons *aposée* comme variante de *esposée*, cf *apouse* variante de *espose* dans God et au contraire *espostre* à côté de *apostre*—"assonager"—'to sound right or harmonious', malheureusement sans indication du vers en question Mais il faut probablement lire *assouager* (angl to assuage)—"batestaus"—(Picard form for batestal) noise, excitement"—je ne vois rien de picard dans une forme normale du paradigme—"charohier (10804)—chercher?" Il s'agit du vers *Dites, signor, quant vodrez vos charchier*, qui figure dans un discours où Berengier exhorte ses amis à piquer en mer pour attaquer Anseïs, donc = *charger* (le bateau pour partir), cf les formes *carchier*, *charohier* dans God—"moisselez (12551)—?" il s'agit de l'expression *dens moisselez*, qui n'est pas inconnue, puisque God a *dens maisselés* 'mâcheher' Pour la labélisation cf *armoire, émoi* etc—"noiauz (8178)—here noyau is a neg word like *mie*, *point*, etc" Non point! *de cest est noiauz* contient a fr (*ne valour*) *noiauz* = *nugalius*, REW 5989—"noster (12827)=noter?" Biffer le point d'interrogation puisque -s- graphique se trouve tant de fois dans notre texte, p ex -este dans le diminutif -ette—"oist (9284)—goes out (from oissir)" Le vers est *Le depesassent si que l'en oist en France*, on ne voit pas l'interprétation de l'éditeur Lire *oist*?—"osteus (9965)—probably part of a harness" On impose un carcan à Alori, qui dit, *Cis osteus est moult grés* J'interprète naïvement 'cet hôtel est très dur' avec cette pointe d'humour macabre qu'a notée l'éditeur aux vers 8591, 8592 Cf fr être logé à la même enseigne, au sens ironique, et, pour le sens méloratif, *Lanval*, 153 154—"tonellement (6345)—uproar?" (*tot le mois furent en grant tonellement*) Mais God donne plusieurs exemples de *toeuillement* et identifie le mot dans notre passage même, d'a fr *tooulier*, angl to toil—"voie (6359)=vivant" Comment un reflet de *virus* pourrait-il avoir osé de? Le vers est *N'est hons qu'est voie qui ne s'en espoent*, donc 'il n'y a homme qui voie cela' (avec *est* pron dém archaïque)

Il ne faudrait pas mettre au glossaire des formes avec ? sans indication du vers (p ex *toivre*). Il y a beaucoup de passages que l'auteur a laissés sans commentaire ou dont il n'a pas vu les diffi-

Delez li s'est el lit couchiez  
Or est Lanval bien herbergiez

cultés—d'une façon générale, les explications données au lexique et au glossaire ne suffisent absolument pas.

v 2868 *Qui l'ot [un cheval] isnel nel donast por Melaus* Le mot *Melaus* est identifié avec le Ménélas de l'Odyssée, qui est véritablement mentionné sous la forme *Melhaus* au v 4516 Mais que voudrait dire 'il n'aurait donné son cheval pour Ménélas'? je comprendrais à la rigueur 'pour la belle Hélène', mais pour le pauvre "las qui s'avance"? Lire *melaus*, cf *neelé* 'or ciselé, émaillé' (de lat *ingellu*) = \**nigell-ahs*?

v 2950 [charniers] *Ou font les morz retor par dedenz laure* L'éditeur explique *retor* 'a refuge or resting place', mais n'identifie pas *laure* Pense-t-il à l'inf *laure* 'laisser' ou à l'*aure*?

v 4516 [la belle Hélène] *Que Melhaus conquist puis a l'acier* *Quant cil de Troies furent tot escillhé* Le ms porte *por* Mais la correction *puis* ne s'impose pas parce qu'Hélène "Troja capta, Ajax eam interficiendam esse proposuit, sed morz, sine sorte, Menelao conceditur teste Dict Cret" (Forcellini-De Vit) *por alacier* signifie 'par tromperie, stratagème' (*alacier* 'allurer') le stratagème de Ménélas était d'adjudger le palladium à Ulysse, non à Ajax qui voulait faire tuer Hélène, et de gagner ainsi le support d'Ulysse pour la reconquête de sa femme, voir *Roman de Troie* vv. 27054 seq (au v 28430 de ce roman *dame Heleine* est désignée par les mots *par cui sont li regne essillhé*, qui rappellent le vers de notre texte *quand cil de Troie furent toz escillhé*).

LEO SPITZER

*Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo* A cura di LUIGI DI BENEDETTO.

(Scrittori d'Italia, n 172) Bari Laterza, 1939. 265 pp.

Lire 25

Fifteen years have passed since Luigi Di Benedetto published in the *Classici italiani con note* (Utet) a volume of Dolce Stil Novo poetry a small volume which has done good service and held its place as the best text for the poems of Cavalcanti, Gianni, Alfani, Frescobaldi and Cino. Since its appearance many important studies have appeared on all of these poets Michele Barbi's studies on the text of Dante's *Canzoniere* have resulted in a much clearer idea of the manuscript tradition on which the Stil Novo corpus must rest. Biographical and historical implications have been explored. The reading of single verses has been discussed and tested by what can be brought from without as contributing doctrine or prevalent lyrical sentiment. The closed garden of the Stil Novo has not gone uncultivated.

With the present volume of the well-known Laterza series, Di Benedetto has turned again to the manuscript sources for his texts

and has followed more closely the definitive results of Barbi in grouping and evaluating them. He has expanded the volume to include all the known poems of Cino da Pistoia (only a selection of them was given in *Utet*) and has included all of the poems of Guido Guinicelli (*Utet* contained only *Al cor gentil . . .*). The poems of Lapo Gianni and Dino Frescobaldi are increased and a number of verses are restored to the latter's *Morte avversara* . . . In only one respect is the present volume reduced in comparison with the preceding those "rime di corrispondenza" by others than the above, compositions which elicited or replied to poems of theirs, are not given. And in truth, they would have added great convenience to this collection as they did to the former. Obviously they cannot be ruled out as not forming a part of Dolce Stil Novo poetry, since a good third of the present collection would have to be eliminated if such a criterion were strictly held. It is simply a question of convenience, as is the label which we continue to extract from a particular episode of the *Purgatorio* and use in our own lax way to the detriment, one often fears, of a more penetrating understanding of just what that poetry is.

That we do not understand these texts in their entirety is a confession which surely even the specialist will be prompt to make. And even the specialist will wish that this volume, at least, of the Laterza series might have had its commentary (in many cases a prose paraphrase is the best form) such as accompanied the *Utet* volume. For there are considerable changes in this body of texts as compared with the former reading, and as a result the *Utet* commentary is no longer adequate. To cite only a few out of many examples: *vil raggio* becomes now *vrago* and *di me ti dole* now stands *di te mi dole* (p. 38), *saluto riswo* becomes *salutorio sivo* (p. 78), *d'Amor mi tolga Morte e dia pace* now reads *d'Amor mi tolgon molto ond'i'ho pace* (p. 96). In many cases it is impossible to say, without turning again to the manuscript sources, whether these are improved readings or not. Probably the *vestita a donnuzza* (p. 68, *Utet*) is rightly corrected to *vestita d'un'uzza* (p. 58, cf. another example in the sonnet attributed to Dante "Sennuccio, la tua poca peisonuzza"). On the other hand, the *fore* in verse 16 of *Cavalcanti XXIV* must surely be *fiore* reinforcing the negation. In *Cino XVI* (p. 119), in two cases *altra* should probably stand as before *alta*, and the *Mero* on p. 217 should remain *Nero* as before and in other texts.

Again, without access to manuscript sources, no sure judgment can be made, in the case of Cino's poetry, of the respective merits of the present text against the critical edition by Zaccagnini (*Biblioteca dell' Archivum Romanicum*). Di Benedetto has profited by the latter's work, but the two remain at considerable variance, in text and to some extent in attribution.

All in all, the present edition of the Stil Novo may well be the best to date. Likewise, it may well not be the best possible. There

is even now a fresh critical edition of the same texts in progress by another scholar. Perhaps when he has done his work, Di Benedetto's can be better measured. Another critical edition is the only adequate criticism of a critical edition.

C S SINGLETON

*Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit.* Herausgegeben von HERMANN GERSTNER und KARL SCHWORM. München: Zentralverlag der NSDAP., Franz Eher Nachf. [1939]. Pp 622.

Although a survey of contemporary literature must be more or less wanting in balanced historical perspective, it is always refreshing to find enterprising spirits who have the temerity to tackle the perennially new problem of literary orientation. Such books have recorded some puzzling misjudgments, but they have also recorded the current views and hopes of their authors and have thus provided for later generations the best possible markers for charting the constant shifting of literary tastes and movements.

This book presents fifty-three authors in alphabetical order. There is a portrait of each author, a sample of his handwriting, and his signature. The personal data, being autobiographical as far as possible, not only list the most noteworthy events in the author's life, but also reveal something of his attitude towards the world—and often towards his own works. Each author's principal works are listed, briefly described, and monotonously praised. The feature of greatest value in the book is the anthological presentation of four to six pages of text from each author. Some of the selections are published here for the first time and many are not easily accessible elsewhere.

The publishers' foreword indicates that the mission of the book is to win readers for the "neue Dichtung." The statement is made that "die Jahre der entarteten Dichtung endgültig überwunden sind," and that the Third Reich has a wealth of writers who conform to the laws of their *Volkstum* and are not concerned with purely aesthetic values. A few "typical representatives" of the older generation are presented alongside of the men and women whose productions root directly in the present.

Who are representative of the older generation? The eldest of the authors discussed are four men born before 1877, they began publishing before 1908. They are Adolf Bartels (1862-1939, published since 1889), who is designated as a literary historian, "ein unermüdlicher volkischer Kämpfer für die Reinheit des Blutes," who treated the racial question "selbstverständlich in unserem volkischen Sinn", Dietrich Eckart (1868-1923; published

since 1904), friend of Hitler's and Rosenberg's, promoter and editor of the Party's *Völkischer Beobachter*, Otto Erler (1872—; publishing since 1899), who shows in his dramatic works a "starke Einfühlungskraft in das Werden unseres Volkstums", and Ludwig Finckh (1876—, publishing since 1900), a physician-poet "so eng mit dem Boden und Herkunft verwurzelt" that he has composed no less than ten books on *Ahnenkunde*—Obviously these are not the authors whom earlier critics have considered representative of German literature

The next seven authors began publishing before the end of the war. They include Friedrich Bethge, Heinrich Zerkau, Robert Hohlbaum, and Hanns Johst. Between 1919 and 1933, twenty-six others put forth their first works. Among them are Richard Euringer, Werner Beumelberg, Johannes Linke, Eberhard Wolfgang Möller, Edwin Erich Dwinger, and Herybert Menzel.

Sixteen approved authors have made their appearance since the founding of the Third Reich. In 1933 Kurt Eggers, Carl Maria Holzappel, Anne Marie Koeppen, and Hans-Jürgen Nierentz. In 1934 Hans Baumann, Fritz Helke, Kurt Koelsch, and Gerhard Schumann. In 1935 Ferdinand Oppenberg and Otto Paust. In 1936 Quirin Engasser, Fritz Stelzner, and Tudel Weller. In 1937 Hanns Gottschalk. In 1938 Martin Dams and Hannes Kremer. Some of these are represented to date by only one book, but this first volume evidently meets the standards laid down for the present survey.

The number of "literary" prizes mentioned is impressive. There are few authors in this book who have not received at least one prize—even if nothing greater than the second lyric prize of the magazine, *Die Dame*. Another very striking thing in this anthology is the value placed on Party connections—even in the discussion of literary efforts. One gradually begins to understand that the "wir" of the foreword ("... dass wir ausserdem einen beglückenden Reichtum von Dramatikern, Lyrikern, und Epikern besitzen") means "We, the Party."

One of the most significant contributions to the anthology is the part of Friedrich Bethge's address, "Krieg und Drama" (pp. 51-56), delivered before the *Theatertagung der HJ* in 1937. One phase of the argument runs: Aeschylus and Cervantes knew the value of war for the poet. Goethe was too conciliatory to be a great dramatist. Neither Kleist nor Hebbel was able to give his best, because the *Volk* did not demand it of them. Grabbe would have been a great dramatist if there had been a war in his time. . . . Yet Bethge fails to mention any great drama produced as a result of the last War.

*Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit* contains a wealth of information about the group of contemporary writers it presents. While from a literary point of view it is uncritical both in respect to selection and discussion of authors, it is very definitely a record of the



directed efforts of Third Reich literary activity. Most of the biographical sketches have been reproduced in the *Völkischer Beobachter* in shortened form (Munchener Ausgabe, early 1939)

EDMUND E. MILLER

*University of Maryland*

---

*Lessing's Dramatic Theory Being an Introduction To And Commentary On His Hamburgische Dramaturgie* By J. G. ROBERTSON, Late Professor of German Language and Literature in the University of London. Cambridge, At the University Press, 1939. x, 544 pp. \$8 00.

This posthumous work of the late Professor J. G. Robertson, of the University of London, is of such encyclopedic proportions that it is about as easily reviewed as a volume of the *Britannica*. The work as it lies before us today was not quite finished by its author. However, he left it in such a condition that its publication has been made possible. The editor, Edna Puidie, has lightened the task of the reviewer by verifying all references and quotations in and of itself a herculean performance.

Professor Robertson has left practically nothing for his successors to do so far as factual matter is concerned. We have here an account of the founding of the Hamburg theater with all necessary documentary evidence, its staff, the repertory (with full information about each and every play and the cast at each performance), a brief notice of Lessing's two earlier theatrical journals, his connection with the enterprise, all of his briefer or more detailed criticism of all the plays performed with all quotations given in the original and divided according to the national literatures to which they belong, and finally a discussion of what Professor Robertson calls in his title "Lessing's Dramatic Theory." With the exception of the last section this represents a mine of information for which future students will bless the author's memory. Nothing has been omitted except the stage versions of the plays performed, and Professor Robertson informs us that he could also have furnished these. To the present reviewer the great value of the book lies just here, namely, as a handbook of facts about the theater at Hamburg and everything connected therewith. Because of its very nature it makes for hard reading, but that does not lessen its value as a reference work.

The title of the book is an unfortunate one. The sub-title would have served the purpose better. When one considers the nature of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* and the circumstances under which it was written, one immediately understands the impossibility of attempting to find in it any conclusive theory of the drama. For what does it consist of? Desultory notes on plays acted, diplo-

matic remarks about the actors, attempts to make the publication look like a periodical, rambling statements on all matters pertaining to the stage and the drama, contradictory presentations of what Professor Robertson considers the main purpose, all sorts of padding such as the long quotations and the detailed account of the contents of the Spanish *Essex*, and finally the discovery on the author's part that the so-called national theater in Hamburg was serving mainly as a vehicle for the presentation of plays of French origin in German translation or German imitations of such plays. Although he denied knowing what patriotism meant, his national pride finally aroused him to an examination of these masterpieces which national vanity and conceit claimed to be perfect representations of Aristotelian theory, to say nothing of their having even surpassed the old master's conception of the drama. And the worst of it all was that all other nations, including the Germans, believed this and attempted to follow in their wake.

The results of the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* should be looked upon as rather negative than positive. It represents the effort to cast down the French idols by showing that they were false gods, and the best way to do this was in the strictly biblical fashion by condemning them out of their own mouths. Furthermore, how under the circumstances mentioned could Lessing have formulated his final views on the subject of dramatic theory? These scattered remarks, contradictory as they are in some instances, cannot be patched together in such a way as to show that here we have Lessing's last words on the subject. It was sufficient to have put Aristotle on the throne and to have showed that the French claims were bogus ones.

We grant that he resorted to exaggeration to prove his point, but it is unfair to accuse him of unfairness toward Voltaire. We but need to think how Lessing would have fared, had Voltaire caught him between a Lessing and a Gotthold Ephraim correspondence such as Lessing reveals between Voltaire and his double, Lindelle. It is also beside the point to discuss Lessing's attitude toward Shakespeare upon the basis of the fact that he did not discuss him in detail in the *Dramaturgie*. Where could this have been done? No Shakespeare play was given, and all his remarks, such as they are, always take their starting point from the plays presented upon the Hamburg stage.

It also must be taken into consideration that Lessing spent a most unhappy time during his stay in Hamburg. Nowhere in his correspondence during that period does he display much interest in his work there. One would rather gather from his correspondence that the *Antiquarische Briefe* were much closer to his heart and absorbed a much larger part of his interest than what was supposed to be his main occupation in that town. He refers to his theatrical periodical as "diesen Wisch" and has very little to say about it. In the language of the eighteenth century the *Ham-*

*burgische Dramaturgie* represents rather "Kollektaneen zu einer Theorie der Tragodie" than a real final and conclusive production<sup>1</sup>

Whether he would have elevated Aristotle to the position of dictator of tragical theory if the French had not claimed him as their authority, may remain unsettled. To the present reviewer it has always seemed as if Aristotle grew upon Lessing in the course of the discussion until he finally made the famous statement that Aristotle is an infallible in his field as Euclid in his. As a true son of the eighteenth century, Lessing was by his very nature bound to base his criticism upon the dictates of reason, upon something which might be proved, hence the indispensability of Aristotle. Authority rather than psychology was the chief thing.

In spite of the fact that Lessing was an omnivorous reader, we might quarrel with the author of this splendid book in his too great inclination to discover the sources for everything which Lessing has to say. But we shall keep out of this dangerous territory where investigators usually lose their way and, instead of not seeing the woods for the trees, see more than are actually there.

Although we still hold fast to the opinion that the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* represents a step backward in the history of the theory of the drama, that its main importance is a negative one, and that in some respects Johann Elias Schlegel anticipated the future development better than Lessing, we should like to close with Professor Robertson's last statement as it best sets forth the underlying idea of the book. The *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* "is not merely, in all essentials, the greatest dramaturgic text-book of its century: it represents in general the most advanced thinking which Europe had attained at the close of the third quarter of that century. We may not be able to learn from it much knowledge which we can apply to the drama of to-day. But even so, we can and do learn from it the best that the eighteenth century thought about the drama of its own age."

ROBERT BRUCE ROULSTON

*The Johns Hopkins University*

---

*Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Facsimile.* Edited by WALTER WILSON GREG. No 1 *King Lear, 1608 (Pied Bull Quarto)*. Pp. viii + lxxxiv. No 2 *The Merchant of Venice, 1600 (Hayes Quarto)*. Pp. viii + lxxvi. No 3. *The Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602*. Pp. viii + lvi. London: The Shakespeare Association, and Sidwick & Jackson, Limited, 1939. 10/6 each

Minute study of the textual and bibliographical problems of the early Shakespeare quartos has hitherto been restricted for the most

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Fünfundneunzigstes Stück

part to the few who had access to the extremely rare originals. It is something of a reproach to scholarship that the quartos, with the five<sup>1</sup> notable exceptions of *Hamlet* (Q<sub>1</sub>, Q<sub>2</sub>), *Pericles* (Q<sub>1</sub>), *Richard II* (Q<sub>3</sub>), and *Titus Andronicus* (Q<sub>1</sub>), have not even been available in satisfactory facsimile, for the unreliability of the Ashbee facsimiles<sup>2</sup> and of the photolithographic series by Griggs and Praetorius is well known. There has been serious need for reproductions that are wholly above suspicion of "improvement" or sophistication. To supply this deficiency the Shakespeare Association has initiated a series of collotype reproductions of the earliest quartos under the editorship of Dr W. W. Greg. The first three have just come from press, and they meet every expectation. The bindings are attractive, and the beautifully clear collotypes give the effect of the original paper and ink. There is no retouching, no hardening of lines, no tampering of any kind. The quartos are reproduced with such fidelity that for most purposes there is no occasion to refer to the originals.

Each facsimile is preceded by a brief introductory note by Dr Greg which gives the entry in the *Stationers' Register*, explains the system of line numbering, and locates extant copies of the quarto.<sup>3</sup> Some of the comments naturally invite comparison with corresponding sections of Miss Henrietta Bartlett's new *Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709*, published almost simultaneously. The first facsimile, the Pide Bull *Lear* (1608), is a reproduction of the Gorhambury copy, containing the unique blank

<sup>1</sup> J. S. Farmer's facsimile of *Richard III* (Q<sub>1</sub>) is based on Ashbee's facsimile, Augustin Daly's reproduction of *Merry Wives of Windsor* (Q<sub>1</sub>) is derived from Griggs.

<sup>2</sup> These are almost as rare as some of the quartos. Only fifty copies of each were prepared, and of these Ashbee and J. O. Halliwell Phillips certify that nineteen were immediately destroyed, leaving only thirty-one sets, of which J. O. H. P. at once used two for collation. Though Ashbee made facsimiles of the forty-three then known quartos published in Shakespeare's lifetime (including *Hamlet* Q<sub>2</sub>, both 1604 and 1605), and also of *Othello* (1622), *Venus and Adonis* (1593, 1594), and *Lucrece* (1594), Sir Edmund Chambers lists only the *Titus Andronicus* (1600) and Farmer's reproduction of the *Richard III* (1597) in his bibliographies in *William Shakespeare*, Vol. I.

<sup>3</sup> He also singles out every reading which a defect in the basic quarto has rendered doubtful or illegible in the collotype, excluding from consideration "those due to defects in the original type (such as broken letters and misshapen stops) which therefore occur in all or some other copies." But these last are still *lectiones difficiles*, and in my opinion they deserve attention. For example in *King Lear*, D<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup>, line 4, the comma after "perforce" is not recognizable, and the apostrophe in "would'st" at E<sub>1</sub>, line 16, is almost imperceptible, in *Merchant*, F<sub>4</sub>, the catchword "hee" is unaccountably faint, in *Merry Wives*, F<sub>2</sub>, line 3 from bottom, "*Gallia* of *Bramford*" is partly obscured by the ink coming through from F<sub>2</sub><sup>v</sup>, and the catchword on E<sub>4</sub> has a faint character following -es in "Godes" in both the collotype and the Folger copy. As this last illustration shows, the difficulty is not in the reproduction but in the original. But in these and similar cases, scholars would welcome Dr Greg's editorial guidance—in fact, they are almost helpless without it.

leaf preceding title which is unknown to Miss Bartlett. The collation in future must be given as  $\pi^2$ , B—L<sup>4</sup>. The Roxburghe copy (British Museum) of the Hayes quarto of *The Merchant of Venice* (1600) is the original of the second facsimile. Owners may wish to note that the W. A. Clark copy is now in the library of the University of California (*Census*, p. 57). A serious discrepancy exists between the two descriptions of the 1602 quarto of *Merry Wives*. Dr. Greg, who reproduces the Huth copy in the British Museum, prefixes the signed preliminary leaf A from the Capell copy at Trinity College, Cambridge, with the statement that this leaf "is wanting in all copies except those in the Bodleian Library and at Trinity College, Cambridge." Miss Bartlett, on the other hand, while agreeing about the British Museum and Trinity College copies, notes that the leaf is wanting in the Bodleian but is present in the Folger and Huntington copies. I can give no information about the copy at Huntington, but in the Folger quarto leaf A<sub>1</sub> is a positive photostat.

Another important section of the prefatory note is devoted to press corrections and a record of the formes which exist in two or more states. It is no detracton from the value of the facsimiles to point out how very helpful it would be if to the collotype of the basic quarto had been appended facsimiles of the variant states not found therein. In the case of *Merry Wives*, no variant states have been noted. *Merchant* could have been cared for by the addition of one leaf bearing on the recto a facsimile of G<sub>4</sub><sup>r</sup> and on the verso one of K<sub>2</sub><sup>r</sup> (not noted by Greg, the Huntington Library *Check-List* of 1919 records that the Kemble-Devonshire copy has the remarkable reading "intergory" for "intergotory" in line 8). *Lear*, however, would have presented a serious problem, for no fewer than twenty-two additional pages (on eleven leaves) would have been necessary to give all the variant states not found in the Gorbambury copy. Such a twenty-five percent increase in the number of collotypes would have increased the cost appreciably. The matter was doubtless considered carefully by the publishers, but the advantages of having within the covers of one book *all* the states of the various formes are so great and so obvious that a modification of policy seems desirable.

Dr. Greg and the Shakespeare Association are to be congratulated on their initial success. The facsimiles will prove indispensable to students of the minutiae of Shakespeare's text and of the bibliographical problems of the quartos. Here for the first time are the plays reproduced with absolute fidelity, and made available at a small fraction of the cost of photostats. Every library and every serious Shakespeare scholar will want to possess the series. It is to be hoped that subscriptions will be so numerous and so prompt that the future of the series will not be placed in jeopardy.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

*The effects of his political life upon John Milton* By PAUL PHELPS MORAND Paris 1939 Pp 124

*De Comus à Satan, l'œuvre poétique de John Milton expliquée par sa vie.* By PAUL PHELPS MORAND Paris 1939 Pp 262.

Dr. Morand's two books offer a complete survey and reinterpretation of Milton's life and poetry. They are very able works showing a thorough acquaintance with the literature of their subject and deserve most careful consideration. The author believes, against the prevalent view, that Milton changed greatly in his beliefs and feelings, and the change came principally from his experience of politics. The crucial period was that of his employment by the Council of State under the Commonwealth. The first book studies this period in detail, the second applies to the whole of Milton's poetical career the conclusions reached in the first book.

Morand takes as his basis Liljegren's researches on Milton's biography and his attacks on Milton's personal integrity. He goes over the same ground and with fine judicial impartiality weighs the evidence for and against Liljegren's contentions. He pronounces Liljegren's facts correct but his conclusions from those facts mistaken. Milton *did* abett the insertion of the Pamela prayer into later editions of *Eikon Basilike*, he *did* consent to act as censor in spite of *Areopagitica*, and he *did* behave unscrupulously in attacking Morus as author of *Regni Sanguinis Clamor* after he had learnt that Morus never wrote it. However, his motives were not personal but political. Milton kept his private integrity as a politician he allowed the ends to justify the means.

What do Morand's results amount to? They are important not because they are new but because, as he presents them, they are reasonable. They thus force us to face facts which we've really been aware of but which most of us have shirked. It doesn't much matter whether or not Milton helped the Pamela forgery, but it does matter that we should face the monstrosity of the whole Pamela passage in *Eikonoklastes*. Milton knew *Arcadia* well and with it the context of Pamela's prayer. He must have known the solemnity of that context, its close relation to the spirit of Protestant sufferings and martyrdoms alive in Sidney's time. We cannot avoid the conclusion that Milton was prepared to sacrifice truth to an immediate political end. He identified himself with the dishonesties and fanaticisms that any minority ruling by power is forced into. In dealing with Milton's part in politics Morand is just, perspicacious, and temperate.

How far this theme can be applied to the whole of Milton is another matter. It should be allowed a closer application than is usually made. But Morand in his general book carries the process too far. His picture of the early Milton, on the whole Christian, not without mysticism, and social-minded, is plausible, though I

disagree with his notion that *Comus* is devoid of realism and that the clergy-passage in *Lycidas* is a prophetic accretion. But that Milton was quite obsessed by a political puritanism which rendered him incapable of repentance and uniformly self-justificatory I cannot agree. Doubtless the trend of politics accounted for much of that conflict of motives in *Paradise Lost* of which Morand gives a brilliant and searching account impossible to criticise properly except at length. But beneath the political fanaticism and the strident abuse or self-justification of the later pamphlets there always remained a core of good sense and wisdom. The *Ode to Rouse* proves where Milton's heart truly was, while Adam's humility in his final talk to Michael, Milton's distrust of action evidenced in *Paradise Regained*, and the repudiation of patriotism in the latest of his letters all suggest that Milton had repented of the part he took in politics, a repentance not the less fundamental because never paraded. Nor is *Samson* purely pessimistic. Manoa's final assurance that all the valiant youth shall resort to Samson's tomb is like the mood that closes *Lycidas* the mood that sets little store by results and great store by the state of mind that is ready to act appropriately, the very reverse in fact of that political opportunism which Morand describes so well. In sum we must give more attention to Milton's political career but not all that Morand would have us give.

There is much else in Morand's general book besides his main thesis. I must mention especially his theory of composite characters in *Paradise Lost*. For instance the Satan of heaven and hell is a different character from the tempter and serpent. It is a most interesting theory which may not only solve difficulties but explain why *Paradise Lost* has paucity but not poverty of character.

E M W TILLYARD

Cambridge University

---

*Walter Bagehot* By WILLIAM IRVINE. New York Longmans, Green and Co., 1939. Pp. 303. \$4.50.

Professor Irvine's *Walter Bagehot* is a compact and accurate summary of the life and writings of President Wilson's favorite Victorian critic. It deserves to become the standard book of reference for those whose requirements do not obligate them to go directly to Bagehot's works. But it adds little unknown material. Mrs Russell Barrington has let Professor Irvine use certain unpublished letters of Bagehot's that shed more light on his personality as a student at school. But Mrs Barrington had already done a surprisingly good job for a relative on Bagehot's life and so had Mr. R. H. Hutton for a friend.

There remained a need, however, for a summary of Bagehot's

opinions on politics, economics, and literature. Satisfied to describe the circumstances of their composition, Mrs Barrington had left their content alone. Professor Irvine's account is satisfactory to the extent that he limits himself to the immediate task. Bagehot was a Victorian Liberal of conservative tendency, who, like Arnold, believed in making haste slowly in matters of social change. But, unlike Arnold's, his own criticism was that of a man of practical affairs, banker and writer for economic journals, who differed from other journalists not in the spontaneity of his output (he was at the opposite pole to Arnold here), but in possessing a sounder and more extensive background of information and an independence of social position as well as a temperament which permitted him sincerity in addition to verve.

All this Professor Irvine gives us, and he is conscious also of Bagehot's limitations when the personal judgment of literary worth gives way to reasoning about esthetic principles. In criticizing Bagehot's theory regarding the distinction between the classic and the romantic, Irvine sensibly comments.

The truth is, no doubt, that he did not know what he meant. By faulty definition and by careless use of terms, he has built up around his ideas just such a verbal screen as he once complained of in other writers. The basic fallacy of his theory lies of course in his use of the word *type*, the inconsistency of which he veils from himself by introducing the corresponding and broader term *literesque*. *Literesque*, closely identified with the typical, is defined as 'fit to be put into a book'. But what is fit to be put into a book may or may not be typical. It was therefore possible to use *literesque* correctly throughout the discussion and at the same time shift the meaning of *type* at convenience. Bagehot's strict employment of the one term probably blinded him to the loose employment of the other (p. 102).

This is a clear distinction of terms, such as modern Humanists are accustomed to make. We wish Professor Irvine had stopt here, and not proceeded to suggest that, lurking in such ambiguities, were the principles of Humanism itself. "A critic who has principles for the judgment of books will presumably have standards for the appraisal of writers. These standards Bagehot nowhere defines, yet everywhere implies" (p. 138). We think that in himself implying Bagehot's Humanism (as Irvine does more explicitly elsewhere), Irvine is not only getting beyond the necessities of his subject, but falling prey to the sort of ambiguity of which he has complained. Humanism, I take it, holds clarity of definition an essential principle. And even the implications of Humanism in Bagehot, I believe, are not altogether consistent. I find them (in contrast to Arnold's criticism) at times too close to the morality of commerce and utilitarianism in the Victorian era for such ready classification. It would have been better had Irvine not sought to remove the ambiguity from Bagehot's implications.

EDWIN BERRY BURGUM



*Journey to Germany, Autumn 1858.* By THOMAS CARLYLE  
 Edited by R. A. E. BROOKS. New Haven Yale University  
 Press, 1940 Pp. xxxviii + 222 \$2.75.

In editing this manuscript, now at Yale University, Professor Brooks has done well his two-fold task. First, he has made accessible a new piece of Carlyle's writing the account of a month-long journey undertaken in order to study twelve of Frederick's battle-fields. The account, crowded with observations on places and people, is written in a style resembling that of the journals and letters. And the immediate meaning of this allusive record is made easy by the editor's map, emendations,<sup>1</sup> explanations, and index.

And, second, the editor has interpreted the broader significance of the record. He has shown the relation of *Journey to Frederick the Great*, and has made that relation throw light on Carlyle's method of writing history. The mass of evidence on these points is presented in twelve appendices. Each appendix compares one battle-account in *Frederick* with the account of the same battle in *Journey*, and with the numerous accounts of that battle in various source-books from which *Frederick* derives.<sup>2</sup> And each appendix closes with a consideration of Carlyle's artistic handling of the scene in *Frederick*. These detailed comparisons, summarized in the Introduction, show "Carlyle's integrity as a historian in finding and dealing fairly with his facts," and show, to some extent, "how he made his accounts graphic as well as accurate" (p. xxxvii).<sup>3</sup> Thus, in his treatment of Carlyle's artistic-historic method, Professor Brooks supplements—and is supplemented by—the work of Professor Harrold and of Mrs. Young.<sup>4</sup>

As Professor Brooks frequently reminds us, this study is limited to only a part of the materials gathered for *Frederick*. To generalize about the development of Carlyle's artistic manner of presenting historical materials, one must go back over a quarter of a century. On August 12, 1834, Carlyle wrote Emerson "The story of the [Diamond] Necklace was the first attempt at an experiment" *Frederick the Great* was his last great attempt.

HILL SHINE

Maryville College

<sup>1</sup> Read *interwedged* for *interwedgeds* (p. 61), 20,000 for 20,00 (63), *described* for *described* (64).

<sup>2</sup> It is worth noting that Archenholz's work, an important source of *Frederick*, was one of the first German books that Carlyle ever owned.

<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere in the Introduction (xvii-xviii), Brooks gives new evidence on Alexander Carlyle's questionable editorial practice.

<sup>4</sup> Harrold he acknowledges (vii, xxii). But Louise M. Young's valuable *Thomas Carlyle and the Art of History* (Philadelphia, 1939) appeared too late for use. Incidentally, the present book will convince Mrs. Young that Carlyle wrote from notes.

*Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain* By JAMES A. S. McPEEK.  
Cambridge Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp. xvii + 411.  
\$5 00. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, xv)

Pursued with intelligent method the study of influences will yet render fundamental services to literary history. Clearly, however, if a classical author is chosen, it is not good method to study his effect on English literature before serious studies have been made of his influence in Italy and France. The question of intermediaries raises too much uncertainty. Mr. McPeck has struggled hard with his bad method, has indeed made some interesting discoveries, but more often he is only able to record his suspicion that an undiscovered Continental imitation may intervene between Catullus and a given English poem (pp. 106, 111, 119, 132, *et passim*). This is not enough when a better method can largely control these intermediate borrowings. McPeck's way logically entails studying at once the entire European influence of Catullus, and this can only be done superficially. Thus his acquaintance with modern Latin writers apparently extends little beyond Gruter's *Delitiae*, and we lose confidence when we find 'Scaliger' (which?) called a 'medievalist' (p. 285), or Joannes Secundus a German (p. 152), or encounter Ludovicus Areostus and Adeodatus Seba (pp. 333-4) instead of Ariosto and Beza. And if Pontanus, Marullus, and Politian 'are not entirely representative of humanism in Italy' (p. 275), then who is? The need of a better control of intermediaries is clear on p. 204. Here it is said that Jonson 'boldly and happily effects an innovation' in a theme of Moschus, and 'without doubt' does so by recalling Catullus. The 'innovation,' however, had already been attached to this theme by Baif, from whom Jonson may well have taken it: see *A J P.* 49 (1928), 121, 130.

On the other hand the general repute of Catullus in England is justly estimated, and special credit is due to the treatment of the interrelations of English poems derived from Catullus. Within his limits ('through the age of Pope'), the author has searched widely, though not exhaustively. I note at random the omission of John Owen and Thomas Pope Blount. More might have been discovered about Catullus in the schools. Thus there was a selection from him in the *Epigrammatum Delectus* used at Eton from 1686 onwards.

Space remains for a few details. Of what use is it to list the poems of Catullus imitated by an English writer without references to that writer's works (pp. 284, 288, 387, etc.)? Misprints occur on pp. 48 (Jonson's), 279 (naisi), 281 (*Fanus*), 283 (cuisdam), 295 (qusto), 296 (*Roma*), 308 (1559), 328 (lompido), 334 (Aeodatus). French accents are badly treated, e.g., 'interrompués' (p. 342). Sir John Davies (pp. 289, 361) is absent from the Index. And what fancy impelled the author sometimes

to print Latin hexameters as distichs (pp. 23, 149, 151, etc.), and again to print elegiac distichs at times as if they were hexameters (pp. 62, 88, 126, etc.) ?

JAMES HUTTON

Cornell University

---

## BRIEF MENTION

---

*The German Popular Play "Atis" and the Venetian Opera.* A study of the conversion of operas into popular plays, 1675-1722, with special reference to the play *Atis* By MARY BEARE Cambridge University Press, 1938. Schon in der Einleitung ihres Buches betont Miss Beare, dass das Volksstück *Atis* "a considerable historical and sociological interest, if little intrinsic literary value" habe. Wir haben es also nicht mit Literatur im höheren und engeren Sinne des Wortes zu tun, sondern mit jenen unterirdischen Strömungen, die Stoffe wie diesen aus der pomposen Opernwelt Venedigs in das deutsche Volksstück und die "Haupt- und Staatsaktion" geschwemmt haben. Es handelt sich um die Vorfahren der deutschen Burleske des 17. Jahrhunderts, aber darüber hinaus gleichzeitig um eine der wichtigsten Kulturadern der europäischen Welt. Die Tatsache, dass das Wiener Volksstück aus der italienischen Oper in das Volk abgesunkenes Kulturgut ist, ist nicht neu, ebenso wenig wie die Einsicht in die Rolle, die das Jesuitendrama der Zeit in diesem Vorgang spielte. Das Verdienst der vorliegenden Arbeit besteht vielmehr darin, die im grossen bekannten Zuge anhand eines aufschlussreichen Einzelfalles im kleinen genau nachgezogen zu haben. Die Geschichte des *Atis*-Textes ist überzeugend erzählt. Als Quelle ist Minatos Oper *Creso* anzusetzen, die im Jahre 1678 für den Wiener Hof in Prosa übersetzt wurde. Dieser offizielle deutsche *Creso* wurde 1684 von Lukas von Bostel für die Hamburger Oper zu einem Singspiel umgearbeitet, das den Titel *Der Hochmuthige, Bestürzte und Wieder- Erhobene Croesus* trug. Im weiteren Verlaufe zeigt sich, dass der Stoff—wie in so vielen Fällen—sehr bald von der Wanderbühne aufgenommen (möglicherweise von der Truppe Haacke-Hoffmann), durch Deutschland getragen und nach Wien zurückgebracht wurde. Das vom Theaterdirektor Hoffmann hergestellte und (jedenfalls in Wien) benutzte Manuskript, jetzt in der Wiener Nationalbibliothek, steht in Miss Beares Untersuchung zur Diskussion. Die Verfasserin hat eine Fülle von Material auf dem engsten Raum zusammengetragen und (besonders für den englischen

Leser<sup>1)</sup> geordnet Das Buch sollte, seiner Klarheit und Grundlichkeit wegen, in jede Darstellung des 17. Jahrhunderts hineingezogen werden

WOLFGANG PAULSEN

*Southwestern College*

*Masters of Dramatic Comedy and Their Social Themes* By HENRY TEN EYCK PERRY Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939. Pp xxiv + 430 \$4 00 Professor Perry has written one of the best surveys of comedy—written it after wide reading and proportionate reflection, which have given him a proper respect for “one of mankind’s most precious and elusive possessions,” but also with gaiety and wit Whether or not laughter can save the world in our time, there is nothing in sight that seems more likely to save it, and Mr Perry is a profound believer in the social salubrity of comedy and in the theater as its best vehicle His book is an exhilarating history of the art, chiefly (but not exclusively) in terms of certain great practitioners. If it has a fault, there is possibly an occasional lack in appreciation of the importance of uncorrective laughter Most comic dramatists have composed primarily to entertain, and there is often more poetry, and usually more liberation, in really inspired clowning than in Meredithian tinkling Here and there, in the chapter on Molière for example, one feels the least bit of bias in the judgment of certain plays. Mr Perry writes learnedly and gracefully on Aristophanes, Plautus, Terence, Jonson, Lope de Vega, Molière, Holberg, Goldoni, Lessing, Raimund, Gogol, Turgenev, Chekhov, and Shaw The works of these masters are described with gusto, and there is just the right amount of connective summary and conclusive generalization, as well as a carefully selected nine-page bibliography of critical and historical works in English The author has let Shakespeare alone, since his contribution to world comedy is “a thing apart” and “should be so treated.” Mr. Perry confides that he would like “some day . . . to make the attempt” Readers of this book are certain to concur in hoping that he will.

H. S

*Mr Cibber of Drury Lane.* By RICHARD HINDRY BARKER. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, no 143. New York Columbia University Press, 1939 Pp. viii + 280. \$3 00 This study is carefully documented: it rests partly on a new search of contemporary manuscripts, pamphlets, and periodicals, and, while the organization is biographical, it includes judicious appraisal and displays a command not only of

the subject but also of the period. The Bibliography, restricted to works by or attributed to Cibber, might profitably have been extended to books and articles about him. No doubt Professor Emmet L. Avery's "*The Craftsman*" of July 2, 1937, and Colley Cibber" (*Research Studies of the State College of Washington*, vii, 90-103) appeared (June, 1939) too late for notice. Mr. Avery's verdict, that the effusion signed "C C P L" was not written by the Poet Laureate, is surely the only possible conclusion, but the sting in the letter's allusions entitles it to mention. Mr. Barker writes with an easy grace and a quiet relish of Augustan and Georgian foibles that would have won the approbation of the great men whom he introduces in the comedy's minor rôles. Pleasant glimpses, in several cases more than glimpses and occasionally very intimate ones, are afforded of Betterton, Steele, Pope, Gay, Fielding, Garrick, and Johnson. Sometimes it is as if we saw a familiar figure with new eyes, because all these eighteenth-century worthies are presented in the Cibberian perspective. Though the airy Colley retains the center of the stage, the author does not try to pull a pair of buskins onto him. There is no attempt to palliate his failure as a poet, on the other hand, he receives all that is due the theatrical merit of his plays, the excellence of his impersonations, and his effectiveness in literary controversy. Like the heroes, if it is proper to call them such, of the true comedies of manners, Cibber is indebted to his defects for his existence. His liveliness loses nothing in the pages of Mr. Barker's solid and entertaining book.

H S

---

*The Gost of Gy*, ed R. H. BOWERS. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1938. Pp. 51. This edition was published as Heft xxxii of Max Forster's *Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*. It gives us a hitherto unprinted prose text of this ME devotional treatise, a text recorded in MS 383 of Queen's College, Oxford. The text proper is followed by a collation with the Vernon text (as printed by Horstman), and by a glossary limited to "obscure words and strained meanings" (p. 49), though few of the words there listed are properly so described. An introduction of seven pages gives us a summary statement about the history, versions, and authorship of the dialogue between Guy's ghost and the prior. The new text, diplomatically printed, will be welcomed by those interested in ME religious prose.

K M.

# INDEX

## SUBJECTS

- Alliteration, Poetic — 388  
 Alsop, Richard —, "A Hartford Wit" 319  
 American Criticism Kulturkritik und Literaturbetrachtung in Amerika 152  
 American Fiction 1774-1850 a Contribution toward a Bibliography 400  
 American Folklore Tales and Songs of Southern Illinois 402  
 American Poetry Primitivism and Decadence, a Study of American Experimental Poetry 152  
 Ames, see Milton  
 Anglo Latin Writers, Books Known to — — from Aldhelm to Alcuin 240  
 Anglo-Saxon, see Old English  
*Anseys de Mes* 624  
 Arnold, Shelley, and Joubert 201  
*Atis*, The German Popular Play — and the Venetian Opera 640  
  
 Bagehot, Walter 636  
 Balzac, Paris dans la *Comédie humaine* de — 157  
 Banks, John, *The Unhappy Favourite or The Earl of Essex* 221  
 Baudelaire, A Self-Estimate by 297, see also 482  
*Beowulf*  
 — 241, Two Notes on — 605, William Taylor of Norwich and — 210  
 Bible, The Literature of the English — 237  
 Biography, A Parasitical Form of — 289  
*Blackwood's Magazine*, see Neal, John  
 Boccaccio  
 — in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters *Palace of Pleasure* 241, *Il Filocolo* 69, *Le Rime L'Amorosa Visione La Caccia di Diana* 69  
 Bridges, Robert, The Dates of Some of —'s Lyrics 199  
 Brown, Tom — of Facetious Memory Grub Street in the Age of Dryden 234  
 Browning, Revision in —'s *Paracelsus* 195  
*Brunanburh* 74  
*Brut y Brenhmedd* 160  
 Buchner, Georg Der Drucker des *Hessischen Landboten* 512  
 Burke, Edmund  
 — and his Kinsmen a Study of the Statesman's Financial Integrity and Private Relationships 307, —'s Error Regarding Sugar-Crystals 47  
 Burns, Robert, Pride and Passion, — 1759-1796 229  
 Byron, A Possible Source for the Female Disguise in —'s *Don Juan* 39  
  
 Carlyle, Thomas  
 — and the Art of History 550, *Journey to Germany, Autumn 1858* 638  
 Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain 639  
 Censorinus, see Shakespeare  
 Champmeslé, Is la *Coupe enchantée* by La Fontaine or — ? 105  
*chanfrein* 134  
 Chaucer  
 — and the Liturgy 357, —'s Archangel 259, —'s Monk 350, 480, —'s *Shipman's Tale* and Ser cambri 142, —'s *Taillynge Ynough*, *Canterbury Tales*, B<sup>a</sup> 1624 262, Arcite's Maying 207, "As by the whelp chastised is the leon" 209, 481, Jacob and the Hooly Jew 254, A Possible Provençal Source for —'s *Hous of Fame*, 300 310 342, Some Further — Allusions 361, Source of the Quotation from Augustine in *The Parson's Tale*, 985 211, The Text of the *Canterbury Tales* 606  
*chaufrein* 134  
*chest* 378.  
 Chrétien de Troyes Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im *Percevalroman* 222.  
 Churchyard's Description of the Queen's Entertainment at Woodstock in 1592 391.

- Cibber  
Colley and Caus — 393, Mr —  
of Drury Lane 641
- Cinema Are We Movie Made? 322
- Coleridge  
— a Biographical Study 227,  
Organic Unity in — 227, —'s  
"Metrical Experiments" 432,  
The Life of S T — the Early  
Years 466, Wordsworth and —  
Studies in Honor of George Mc-  
Lean Harper 466
- Colonne, Guido delle, *Historia De-  
structionis Troiae* 78
- Comedy Masters of Dramatic —  
and then Social Themes 641
- Conduct Books Some Plagiarisms  
in 17th Century Books of Advice  
to Children 416, see also English  
Books of Instruction for Princes
- Conrad, Joseph 316
- Cornelle  
The Date of Mme Deshoulières's  
Parody of *le Cid* 451, The Date  
of the *Cid* in English 575
- Corpus Christi Play, see English  
Mystery Plays
- Courtesy Books, see Conduct Books
- Criticism  
The Personal Heresy, a Contro-  
versy 233, Rehabilitations and  
Other Essays 235
- Dallas, E S — in Trollope's *Auto-  
biography* 422
- Day, John, A Second Version of  
—'s *Peregrinatio Scholastica* 35
- Defoe  
—'s First Poem 314, —'s *Review*  
218, Evidence for —'s Author-  
ship of *The Memoirs of Captain*  
*Carleton* 430
- Dennis, John, The Critical Works  
of — 315
- Deor, Four Text-Notes on — 204
- Deshoulières, The Date of Mme —'s  
Parody of *le Cid* 451
- Desportes 579
- Diderot  
La Correspondance de — 472,  
The Dates of —'s Birth and  
Death 31
- Donne's *Paradoxes* in 1707 53
- Drummond, William, Un Sonnet de  
— et son point de départ dans la  
*Semaine de Du Bartas* 493
- Du Bartas, see Drummond, William
- Ecclestone, Edward, Milton and  
—'s *Noah's Flood* 183.
- écrier(s')*, The Rise and Fall of —  
in French 323
- emem den Hahnenfusz unterbreiten*  
366
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, The Letters  
of — 231, 425
- English The Literature of Slang  
473
- English Books of Instruction for  
Princes *Englische Fürstenspiegel*  
vom *Polycraticus* Johannis von  
Salisbury bis zum *Basiliikon*  
*Doron* König Jakobs I 241
- English Drama  
The Baroque Character of the  
Elizabethan Tragic Hero 456,  
Elizabethan and Jacobean Play-  
wrights 456, English Revenge  
Tragedy 1587-1642 536, Five  
Elizabethan Tragedies 456, The  
Invisible World A Study of  
Pneumatology in Elizabethan  
Drama 455, Modesty in the Au-  
dience 570, References to the  
Drama in the Mildmay Diary  
589, The Relation of Molière to  
Restoration Comedy 77, Some  
Notes on 18th Century Essex  
Plays 176, The Staging of Eliza-  
bethan Plays at the Red Bull  
Theater 1605-1625 540
- English Language and Literature,  
Annual Bibliography of 239
- English Literature  
Catullus in Strange and Distant  
Britain 639
- English Mystery Plays A Note on  
the Relation of the Corpus Christi  
Procession to the Corpus Christi  
Play in England 83
- English Novel, The History of the  
—, Vol x—Yesterday 552
- English Poetry  
Elizabethan and 17th Century  
Lyrics 239, Studies in Meta-  
physical Poetry 456
- English Prosody The Prosody of  
the Tudor Interlude 455
- English Theater, see English Drama
- escharevotée 'écorchée'* 447
- Essex, Some Notes on 18th Century  
— Plays 176
- Faust Book*, see Marlowe
- Fiction, Recent Works on Prose —  
Before 1800 54
- Flaubert, *Une Nuit de Don Juan*  
516
- Fortnightly Review*, The Party of

- Humanity, *The* — — and its Contributors, 1865-1874 302
- French
- Edmond — Puxi — Michel, les Prénoms de trois enfants 621, Studies in — Language and Mediaeval Literature 557
- French Literature
- Hommes et œuvres du xx<sup>e</sup> siècle 158, 19th Century French Readings 320
- Fuller, Thomas
- The Formation of —'s "Holy and Profane States" 147, *The Holy State and the Profane State* 147
- funk 265
- Galloway and the Romances 363
- Galt, John, *The Gathering of the West* 316
- García Gutiérrez
- —'s Birth-Date 296, A Note on the Sources of *Venganza catalana* 454.
- Garrick, David, The Journal of — Describing his Visit to France and Italy in 1763 560
- Gast of Gy, *The* 642
- Gautier d'Aupais, A Monetary Question in — — ? 338, see also 561
- Gawan and the Green Knight 159, 604
- Gentleman-Cully (*The*) 396
- Gentleman's Magazine (*The*), The First Magazine, a History of — — 305
- George
- 321, Briefwechsel zwischen — und Hofmannsthal 67
- German, Forms of Address in — (1500-1800) 298
- German Literature Problems in German Literary History of the 15th and 16th Centuries 543
- German Poetry Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit 628
- Gleim, Vier Briefe aus —'s Freundeskreise 433
- Goethe
- 's *An den Mond* 509, *Heaven-jewen Faust II*, L 6199 117, Rousseau and Faust 581, *Urfaust* L 309 201
- Gothic þis 599
- Gracián, Baltasar, *El Criticón* 556
- Grobiana's Nuptials, The Text of — 109
- Guérault 579.
- Guido de Columnis, see Colonne
- Guillaume de Wadington, see William of Wadington
- Hahnenfusz, Einem den — unter breiten* 366
- Haller and Wieland 110
- Hardy, Thomas, Rebekah Owen and — 316
- Harper, George McLean, Wordsworth and Coleridge Studies in Honor of — 466
- Harvey, Gabriel "Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo" 418
- Haust, Jean, *Mélanges de linguistique romane offerts à M —* 401
- Hazlitt, A MS Addition to —'s *Essay on the Fear of Death* 45
- Herbert, A Borrower from Quarles and — 50
- Hippolyte, see Phèdre
- Hobhouse, see Moore
- Hofmannsthal 321, see also George.
- Holmes of the Breakfast-table 400
- Hopkins, Charles, A Note on — (c 1671 1700) 191
- Howard, Sir Robert, The Marriages of — 410
- Hugo, *Favras* and —'s *Marie Tudor* 24
- Huntington Library, Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the — — 322
- Iconology, see Renaissance
- Illinois, Tales and Songs of Southern — 402
- Ireland, William, The Fourth Forger — and the Shakespeare Papers 456
- Italian Etymological Notes 79
- Italian Influence in France Un Recueil italianisant du 18<sup>e</sup> siècle français 528
- Italian Poetry: Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo 626
- Jean Renart, Counter-Notes on — 8.
- Johnsonian Gleanings Part IX, a Further Miscellany 479
- Jonson, Ben
- (A Concise Bibliography) 238; Classical Mythology in the Plays, Masques, and Poems of — 310; An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy J. B. Rousseau as an Imitator of — 170



- Joubert, Arnold, Shelley, and — 201  
 Judaeo-French, The Plural Usage in — 532.
- Keats, John, The Poetical Works of — 546
- Keller, The Conclusion of —'s *Grüne Heinrich* 285
- Kennings Die altenglischen Kennningar, ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde altgermanischer Dichtung 73
- King of Tars*, Trivet's Constance and the — — 354
- Kipling's Reading and its Influence on his Poetry 560
- Klein, Anton von, see Schiller
- Kleist  
 Die *Berliner Abendblätter* Heinrich von —, ihre Quellen und ihre Redaktion 301, A "Falsified Verse" in —'s *Homburg* 505
- Kyd Die Zusätze zur *Spanish Tragedy* 456
- La Fontaine, Is *la Coupe enchantée* by — or Champmeslé? 105
- Larpent Plays, Catalogue of the — — in the Huntington Library 322
- Lawman, The English River-Names in —'s *Brut* 373
- Layamon, see Lawman
- Lazarillo de Tormes*, A Note on the — 130
- Lazarus, Emma, Letters to — in the Columbia University Library 561
- Leblanc, Un Texte inédit de l'abbé — sur les *Lettres philosophiques* de Voltaire 503
- Lenz, Rodolfo, Homenaje a la memoria del Dr — 156
- Leopardi, A Note on —'s *Bruto Minore* 524
- Lessing's Dramatic Theory Being an Introduction to and Commentary on his *Hamburgische Dramaturgie* 630
- Lichtenbergs Vortrag über die Charaktere in der Geschichte und sein Gesamtwerk 123
- Lingua Nostra* 469
- Lipsius, Iustus, Two Bookes of Constance Written in Latine by — Englished by Sir John Stadling 475
- Lloyd, Elizabeth — and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters 559
- Lydgate's *Horse, Sheep and Goose* and Huntington MS HM 144 563
- Lyndsay, Sir David —, Poet, and Satirist of the Old Church in Scotland 240
- Machiavelli, The Date of —'s *Man-dragola* 526
- manque (le) d'argent qui se fait rare* 332
- Marlowe, The English *Faust Book* and the Date of —'s *Faustus* 95
- Marot au Châtelet 1
- Massinger The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach 77
- Medieval Number Symbolism 78
- Meistersinger schule*, Was there a — at Danzig? 280
- Melon, see Rousseau, J-J
- Melville in the South Seas 318
- Memoirs of Captain Carleton*, see Defoe
- Meredith, George — and his German Critics 553
- Merville et T. Sauvage, *Favras*, see Hugo
- Middle English  
 A Manual of the Writings in — — 78, Three Textual Notes on 14th Century Poetry 379
- Middle English Lyrics  
 A Note on "A Song of the Five Joys" 249, Notes on — — — 243, Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century 308
- Middle High German *Vrasmunt*  
 Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Wortgeschichte Beilage Das Mainzer Friedgebot vom Jahre 1300 545
- Mildmay, References to the Drama in the — Diary 589
- Milton  
 — and Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood* 183, — on himself 215, The —ic Setting, Past and Present 215, —'s English Again 591, —'s Use of Wolleb and Ames 403, The Date of —'s *Proposals for a Firme Government* 407, De Comus à Satan, l'œuvre poétique de — expliquée par sa vie 635, The Effects of his Political Life upon John Milton 635, Shelley and — 585, A Study of —'s Christian Doctrine 212
- Molière  
 A Possible Source of a *Jeu de Scène* in —'s *Ecole des mœurs*

- 453, The Relation of — to Restoration Comedy 77  
 Montchrestien, Antoine de, *Aman*, a Critical Edition 555  
 Moore to Hobhouse an Unpublished Letter 42  
 Motherwell, The Source of —'s *Melancholye* 296  
 Motion Pictures, see Cinema  
 Moxon, Edward —, Publisher of Poets 307  
 Neal, John, American Writers a Series of Papers Contributed to *Blackwood's Magazine* (1824-1825) by — 319  
 Neale, Thomas, *The Warde* 455  
*North Briton (The)*, a Study in Political Propaganda 302  
 Number Symbolism, Medieval — — 78  
 Old English. Case-Forms in — in the Oldest English Texts 136  
 Old-English Charms, Notes on the — 139  
 Old French Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature 557  
 Old Icelandic, On Six — — Words 596  
 Owen, Rebekah — and Thomas Hardy 316  
 Paine, Thomas, Six New Letters of — 400  
 Pater, Walter, Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di — 232  
*Pathelin*, 1519-1522 106  
 Petty, Sir William, see Rousseau, J.-J.  
 Phedre, Le Thème de — et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française 76  
*Physiologus*, The Icelandic — Facsimile Edition with an Introduction 541  
 Poetry Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung System und Methodenlehre der Literaturwissenschaft, i Werk und Dichter 65  
 Pope, Mildred K., Studies in French Language and Mediaeval Literature Presented to Professor — 557  
 Prior, Matthew —, Poet and Diplomatist 548  
 Quarles, A Borrower from — and Herbert 50.  
 Racine, Jean 534  
 Rambervillers, Alphonse de —, Ligueur 442  
 Renaissance, Studies in Iconology Humanistic Themes in the Art of the — 478  
 Renart, see Jean Renart  
 Restoration Comedy, see English Drama  
 Rilke 321  
 Romances, Galloway and the — 363  
 Ronsard 579  
 Rossetti's *Sister Helen* 238  
 Rousseau, J. B., An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy — as an Imitator of Ben Jonson 170  
 Rousseau, Jean Jacques  
 —, Melon, and Sir William Petty 499, — and Faust 581, — et les réformateurs du théâtre 161, — Hero-Worship an Unpublished Intimate Record of 1766 449, The Basis of —'s Contemporaneous Reputation in England 270  
 Sauvage, T, see Merville  
 Schiller, Ein Brief —s an Anton von Klein 441  
*Seege of Troye*, a Study 242  
 Sercambi, see Chaucer  
 Shakespeare  
 — 456, — Criticism An Essay in Synthesis 456, — Personliches aus Welt und Werk 456, — Quartos in Collotype Facsimile *King Lear*, 1608, *The Merchant of Venice*, 1600, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1602 632, — Studies *Macbeth* 456, —'s Attitude towards the Catholic Church in *King John* 455, The Art and Life of — 534, A Census of —'s Plays in Quarto 1594 1709 226, Call Satyre and —'s *Troilus and Cressida* 71, Copyhold Tenure and *Macbeth*, III, II, 38 483, The Fourth Forger William Ireland and the — Papers 456, *House and Slaves* in *King Lear* 594, The Jacobean — and *Measure for Measure* 456, Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Censorinus 103, *Julius Caesar* 145, *Love's Labour's Lost*, IV, III, 285 362 102, *Macbeth* 145, *The Passionate Pilgrim* 462, Poetic Alliteration 388, Prolegomena for the Oxford —, a Study in Editorial Method 150,

- The Sequence of Scenes in *Hamlet* 382, Die Sprache — in Veis und Prosa 456, Theobald's Alleged — MS 108
- Shelley  
— and Milton 585, Arnold, — and Joubert 201, Parallels to Some Passages in *Prometheus Unbound* 428
- Sidney, Das Bild Sir Philip — in der englischen Renaissance 456
- Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* see *Gawain*
- Slang, The Literature of — 473
- "Song (A) of the Five Joys" 249
- Spenser  
"Hobgoblin runne away with the Garland from Apollo" 418, Three Imitations of — 431
- Steele  
Contemporary Allusions in *The Tatler* 292, Goldsmith and — *Englishman* 294
- Stevenson, Robert Louis 197
- Stradling, Sir John, see Lipsius, Iustus
- Stylistics  
Die altenglischen Kenningar, ein Beitrag zur Stilkunde altgermanischer Dichtung 73, Russisch-nationale Stilkunde 16, Le Style "circulaire" 495
- Taylor, William — of Norwich and *Beowulf* 210
- Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare MS 108
- Trivet's Constance and the *King of Tars* 354
- Trollope's *Autobiography*, E S Dallas in — — 422
- Udall, Nicholas —'s *Roister Doister* 476
- Valentine and Orson* 242
- Vauvenargues, Une Philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, Marquis de — 312
- Vigny  
Russisch-nationale Stilkunde [*le Cor*] 16, Three Sources of —'s *Journal* 583
- Voltaire, Un Texte inédit de l'abbé Leblanc sur les *Lettres philosophiques* de — 503
- Vrasmunt Ein Beitrag zur mittelhochdeutschen Wortgeschichte 545
- Watson, Henry (trans), *Valentine and Orson* 242
- Whittier, Elizabeth Lloyd and the —, a Budget of Letters 559
- Widuth, The Myrtingas of — 141
- Wieland, Haller and — 110
- Wildenbruch, *Siegfrieds Blut* Russisch-nationale Stilkunde 16
- William of Waddington, *le Manuel des Pechiez* A 14th Century Scribe 601
- Winckelmann 82
- Wolfe, see Milton
- Wordsworth  
— and Coleridge Studies in Honor of George McLean Harper 466, — and the Pathetic Fallacy 187, The Letters of William and Dorothy — the Later Years 464
- Wulfilas über die Wortgruppen weltanschaulichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Ulfilas 154
- Young, The Dating of —'s *Night-Thoughts* 194
- Zola, Translations of — in the U S prior to 1900 520

## AUTHORS OF ARTICLES AND OF BOOKS REVIEWED

- Adams, J Q (ed), *The Passionate Pilgrim* 462
- Adams, N B and Salley, W C, A Note on the Sources of *Venganza catalana* 454
- Allen, R J, Contemporary Allusions in *The Tatler* 292
- Anderson, C R, Melville in the South Seas 318
- Armstrong, E C, OFr *Chaufrem* and OFr-MFr *Chaufrem* 134
- Atkins, S, *Urfaust* L 309 201.
- Atkinson, D F, Some Further Chaucer Allusions 361
- Baird, J R, Milton and Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood* 183
- Baker, C, A Note on Shelley and Milton 585
- Baker, E A, The History of the English Novel 552, see also Peter, G B
- Baldensperger, F, Un Sonnet de William Drummond et son point

- de départ dans la *Semaine* de Du Bartas 493
- Ball, R H, The Amazing Career of Sir Giles Overreach 77
- Bandy, W T, A Self Estimate by Baudelaire 297, see also 482
- Bang, C K, Haller and Wieland 110
- Barker, R H, Mr Gibber of Drury Lane 641
- Bartlett, H C and Pollard, A W, A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709 226
- Battaglia, S (ed), Boccaccio, *Il Filocolo* 69
- Bazell, C E, Case-Forms in -s in the Oldest English Texts 136
- Beall, C B, Un Recueil italienisant du 18<sup>e</sup> siècle français 528
- Beare, M, The German Popular Play Acts and the Venetian Opera 640
- Bell, C H, Was there a *Meistersingerschule* at Danzig? 280
- Bennett, J W, Churchyard's Description of the Queen's Entertainment at Woodstock in 1592 391
- Bernard, J E, Jr, The Prosody of the Tudor Interlude 455
- Bernbaum, E, Recent Works on Prose Fiction Before 1800 54
- Bird, C W, Three Sources of Vigny's *Journal* 583
- Black, M W (ed), Elizabethan and 17th Century Lyrics 239
- Blair, L, A Note on the Relation of the Corpus Christi Procession to the Corpus Christi Play in England 83
- Blair, T M H (ed), Banks, *The Unhappy Favourite* 221
- Blenner-Hassett, R, The English River-Names in Lawman's *Brut* 373
- Boehrer, R (ed), Briefwechsel zwischen George und Hofmannsthal 67
- Boeschstein, H, see Lange, V
- Bonno, G, Un Texte inédit de l'abbé Leblanc sur les *Lettres philosophiques* de Voltaire 503
- Booth, B A (ed), Galt, *The Gathering of the West* 316, Moore to Hobhouse an Unpublished Letter 42.
- Borish, M E, A Second Version of John Day's *Peregrinatio Scholastica* 35.
- Bowers, F T, Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587 1642 536
- Bowers, R H (ed), *The Gast of Gy* 642, *The Text of Gribanad's Nuptials* 109
- Boyce, B, Tom Blown of Facetious Memory 234
- Branca, V (ed), Boccaccio, *Le Rime L'Amorosa Visione La Caccia di Diana* 69
- Braunlich, A F, Parallels to Some Passages in *Prometheus Unbound* 428
- Brooks, R A E (ed), Carlyle, *Journey to Germany, Autumn* 1858 638
- Broughton, L N, see Serjeantson, M S
- Brown, C (ed), Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century 308
- Brown, C S, Jr and West, R H, "As by the whelp chastised is the leon" 209, see also 481
- Buhler, C F, Lydgate's *Horse, Sheep and Goose* and Huntington MS HM 144 563
- Burke, W J, The Literature of Slang With an Introductory Note by E Partridge 473
- Cadwalader, J, Theobald's Alleged Shakespeare MS 108
- Caldwell, R A, Chaucer's *Taillynge Ynough, Canterbury Tales*, B<sup>a</sup> 1624 262
- Campbell, A (ed), *The Battle of Brunanburh* 74
- Campbell, M E, Defoe's First Poem 314
- Campbell, O J, Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* 71
- Carlson, C L, The First Magazine, a History of *The Gentleman's Magazine* 305
- Chambers, E K, Coleridge 227
- Chambers, R W, The Jacobean Shakespeare and *Measure for Measure* 456
- Cioranescu, Al, Alphonse de Rambervillers, *Ligueur* 442
- Clark, A F B, Jean Racine 554
- Clark, H H (ed), Six New Letters of Thomas Paine 400
- Clarkson, P S and Warren, C T, Copyhold Tenure and *Macbeth*, III, II, 38 483.
- Coles, B, Shakespeare Studies. *Macbeth* 456.

- Colimore, F. D., The Date of Machiavelli's *Mandragola* 526
- Cooley, F., William Taylor of Norwich and *Beowulf* 216
- Crosby, H. L., Jr., Two Notes on *Beowulf* 605
- Currier, T. F. (ed.), Elizabeth Lloyd and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters 559
- De Selincourt, E. (ed.), The Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth 464
- Di Benedetto, L. (ed.), Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo 626
- Dickson, A. (ed.), Henry Watson (trans.), *Valentine and Orson* 242
- Diekhoff, J. S., Milton on himself 215
- Eastman, C. W., Goethe's *An den Mond* 509
- Estrich, R. M., A Possible Provençal Source for Chaucer's *House of Fame*, 300-310 342
- Everett, E. M., The Party of Humanity, *The Fortnightly Review* and its Contributors, 1865-1874 302
- Eves, C. K., Matthew Prior 548
- Fenimore, E., A Monetary Question in *Gautier d'Aupais*? 338, see also 561
- Ferguson, D., Pride and Passion, Robert Burns 1759 1796 229
- Fink, Z. S., The Date of Milton's *Proposals for a Firme Government* 407
- Fitch, G. B., *Favras* and Hugo's *Marie Tudor* 24
- Fox, B., Revision in Browning's *Paracelsus* 195
- Françon, M., Marot au Châtelet 1
- Frank, G., *As by the Whelp Chastised is the Leon* 481
- Franz, W., Die Sprache Shakespeares in Vers und Prosa 456
- Friedman, A., Goldsmith and Steele's *Englishman* 294
- Furst, N., The Conclusion of Keller's *Gruener Heinrich* 285
- Gallacher, S. A., *Einem den Hahnenfuss unterbreiten* 366
- Garrod, H. W. (ed.), The Poetical Works of John Keats 546
- Gerstner, H. and Schworm, K. (eds.), Deutsche Dichter unserer Zeit 628
- Gilbert, A. H., Jacques' "Seven Ages" and Censorinus 103
- Gillet, J. E., A Note on the *Lazarillo de Tormes* 130
- Green, H. J. (ed.), *Anseys de Mes* 624
- Greenewald, G. M., Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Catholic Church in *King John* 455
- Greg, W. W. (ed.), Shakespeare Quartos in Collotype Facsimile 632
- Grégoire, A., Edmond — Puxi — Michel, les Prenoms de trois enfants 621
- Griffin, N. E. (ed.), Guido de Columnis, *Historia Destructionis Troiae* 78
- Griggs, E. L. (ed.), Wordsworth and Coleridge 466
- Grubbs, H. A., An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy J. B. Rousseau as an Imitator of Ben Jonson 170
- Guerard, A., Jr., The Dates of Some of Robert Bridges' Lyrics 199
- Gunagh, K., Source of the Quotation from Augustine in *The Parson's Tale*, 985 211
- Hall, C. M., see Kirk, R.
- Hanson, L., The Life of S. T. Coleridge 466
- Harper, G. L., see Subjects
- Harrington, K. P., Richard Alsop, "A Hartford Wit" 319
- Hatcher, A. G., The Rise and Fall of *s'écrier* in French 323
- Haust, Jean, see Subjects
- Havens, G. R., The Dates of Diderot's Birth and Death 31, Rousseau, Melon, and Sir William Petty 499
- Henkin, L. J., Jacob and the Hooly Jew 254
- Hermannsson, H. (ed.), The Icelandic *Physiologus* 541
- Hofstrand, G., *The Seege of Troye*, a Study 242
- Holmes, U. T., Jr., *Pathelin*, 1519-1522 106
- Hook, J. N., Three Imitations of Spenser 431
- Hooker, E. N. (ed.), The Critical Works of John Dennis 315
- Hopper, V. F., Medieval Number Symbolism 78

- Hornstein, L H, Trivet's Constance and the *King of Tars* 354
- Houghton, W E, Jr, The Formation of Thomas Fuller's "Holy and Profane States" 147
- Howe, M A D, Holmes of the Breakfast-table 400
- Hutton, J, Three Notes on French Authors Desportes, Gueroult, Ronsard 579
- Irvine, W, Walter Bagehot 636
- Jones, A E, A Note on Charles Hopkins (c 1671-1700) 191
- Jones, M B, Translations of Zola in the U S prior to 1900 520
- Kellermann, W, Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman 222
- Kirk, R and Hall, C M (eds), Two Bookes of Constance Written in Latine by Iustus Lipsius 475
- Kirschbaum, L, The Sequence of Scenes in *Hamlet* 382
- Kittredge, G L (ed), Shakespeare, *Macbeth*, *Julius Caesar* 145
- Kleineke, W, Englische Fürstenspiegel vom *Policraticus* Johannis von Salisbury bis zum *Basiliikon Doron* König Jakobs I 241
- Kleinschmidt, J R, The Date of the *Old* in English 575
- Knickerbocker, W S, Arnold, Shelley, and Joubert 201
- Kocher, P H, The English *Faust* Book and the Date of Marlowe's *Faustus* 95
- Koenig, V F, Counter-Notes on Jean Renart 8
- Krakeur, L G, La Correspondance de Diderot 472.
- Kuhl, E P, Chaucer's Monk 480
- Kunstmann, J G, Chaucer's Archangel 259
- Kurrelmeyer, W, Ein Brief Schillers an Anton von Klein 441, Vier Briefe aus Gleims Freundeskreise 433
- Laird, C, A 14th Century Scribe 601
- Lancaster, H C., Is *la Coupe en chantée* by La Fontaine or Champmeslé? 105
- Lange, V and Boeschenstein, H, Kulturkritik und Literaturbeurteilung in Amerika 152
- Las Veignas, R, Joseph Conrad 316
- Lenz, R, see Subjects
- Levy, R, Is *Gautier d'Aupais* a Typical "Poeme Courtois"? 561, The Plural Usage in Judaeo-French 532
- Lewis, C S, Rehabilitations and Other Essays 235, see also Tillyard, E M W
- Livingston, C H, English *Funk* 265
- Lohmann, O, Die Sage von *Gawain und dem grünen Ritter* 159
- Logan, J V, Wordsworth and the Pathetic Fallacy 187
- Lumiansky, R M, Milton's English Again 591
- McGing, M E, A Possible Source for the Female Disguise in Byron's *Don Juan* 39
- McIlwraith, A K (ed), Five Elizabethan Tragedies 456
- McKenzie, G, Organic Unity in Coleridge 227
- McKerrow, R B, Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare 150
- MacMillan, D, Catalogue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library 322, Some Notes on 18th Century Essex Plays 176
- McPeck, J A S, Catullus in Strange and Distant Britain 639
- Magoun, F P, Jr, On Six Old-Icelandic Words 596
- Mair, J, The Fourth Forger 456
- Malakis, E, Baudelaire and Bandy 482
- Malone, K, The Myrtingas of *Widsith* 141
- Manly, J M and Ruckert, E (eds), The Text of the *Canterbury Tales* 606
- Marquardt, H, Die altenglischen Kenningar 73
- Maiv Immaculate, Sister, A Note on "A Song of the Five Joys" 249.
- Mautner, F H, Lichtenbergs Vortrag über die Charaktere in der Geschichte und sein Gesamtwerk 123
- Maxwell, B, S A Tannenbaum, Bibliographies 160
- Menner, R J, Notes on M E Lyrics 243
- Menon, C N, Shakespeare Criticism 456
- Merriam, H G, Edward Moxon, Publisher of Poets 307

- Metcalf, G J, Forms of Address in German (1500 1800) 298
- Mitchell, J A (ed), Neale, *The Warde* 455
- Moley, R, *Aie We Movie Made?* 322
- Monnet, C (trans), F Oliveira (ed), *Beowulf* 241
- Moore, J R, Evidence for Defoe's Authorship of *The Memoirs of Captain Carleton* 430
- Morand, P P, De Comus à Satana 635, The Effects of his Political Life upon John Milton 635
- Mossner, E C, Rousseau Hero-Worship 449
- Murison, W, Sir David Lyndsay 240
- Neely, C (collector) and Spargo, J W (ed), Tales and Songs of Southern Illinois 402
- Newton, W, Le Thème de Phèdre et d'Hippolyte dans la littérature française 76
- Nobbe, G, *The North Briton*, a Study in Political Propaganda 302
- Norman, H L, A Note on Leopardi's *Bruto Minore* 524
- Ogilvy, J D A, Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin 240
- Olivero, F (ed), *Beowulf* 241, Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater 232
- Panofsky, E, Studies in Iconology 478
- Parker, J H, A Possible Source of a *Jeu de Scène* in Molière's *École des maris* 453
- Parry, J J (ed and trans), *Brutus Brenhnedd* 160
- Partridge, E, see Burke, W J
- Pattee, F L (ed), J Neal, American Writers 319
- Perry, H Ten E, Masters of Dramatic Comedy and their Social Themes 641
- Petersen, J, Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung 65
- Petter, G B, George Meredith and his German Critics With a preface by E A Baker 553
- Pettit, H, The Dating of Young's *Night-Thoughts* 194
- Peyie, H, Hommes et œuvres du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle 158
- Pollard, A W, see Bartlett, H C
- Pope, M K, see Subjects
- Potter, G R, Donne's *Paradoxes* in 1707 53
- Platt, R A, Chaucer's *Shipman's Tale* and Sercambi 142
- Privitera, J F, The Date of Mme Deshoulières's Parody of *le Cid* 451
- Raith, J, Boccaccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters *Palace of Pleasure* 241
- Ralph, P L, References to the Drama in the Mildmay Diary 589
- Reade, A L, Johnsonian Gleanings 479
- Reese, H, A Borrower from Quarles and Herbert 50
- Reynolds, G F, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605 1625 540
- Richardson, L C, A Note on *Chest* 378
- Rickett, E, see Manly, J M
- Robertson, J G, Lessing's Dramatic Theory 630
- Roellinger, F X, E S Dallas in Trollope's *Autobiography* 422
- Romera-Navarro, M (ed), Gracián, *El Criticón* 556
- Rooth, E, *Vrasmunt* 545
- Rosenfeld, M-V, Chaucer and the Liturgy 357
- Rusk, R L (ed), The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson 231, Letters to Emma Lazarus 561
- Salley, W C, see Adams, N B
- Savage, H, Arcite's Maying 207, A Note on *Sir Gawain* 1795 604
- Scheurweghs, G (ed), Nicholas Udall's *Roister Doister* 476
- Schunz, A (ed), 19th Century French Readings 320
- Schneider, H, Der Drucker des *Hessischen Landboten* 512
- Schucking, L L, The Baroque Character of the Elizabethan Tragic Hero 456, Die Zusätze zur *Spanish Tragedy* 456
- Schworm, K, see Gerstner, H
- Scott, F R, The Marriages of Sir Robert Howard 410
- Scott-Craig, T S K, Milton's Use of Wollib and Ames 403

- Secord, A W (ed), Defoe's *Re new* 218
- Seiver, G O (ed), Montchrestien, *Aman* 555
- Selincourt, E de, see De Selincourt
- Sembdner, H., Die *Belinen Abend-blätter* Heinrich von Kleists, ihre Quellen und ihre Redaktion 301
- Serjeantson, M S and Broughton, L N, Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature 239
- Sewell, A, A Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine 212
- Shields, A K, García Gutiérrez's Birth-Date 296
- Shook, L K, Notes on the Old-English Charms 139
- Shudofsky, M M, *The Gentleman Cully* 396
- Siebeck, B, Das Bild Sir Philip Sidney's in der englischen Renaissance 456
- Silz, W, A "Falsified Verse" in Kleist's *Homburg?* 505
- Simson, B D, The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson Addenda 425
- Singer, A E, Flaubert's *Une Nuit de Don Juan* 516
- Sledd, J, *House and Slaves in King Lear* 594, Three Textual Notes on 14th Century Poetry 379
- Sloane, W, Some Plagiarisms in 17th Century Books of Advice to Children 416
- Snyder, E D, A Note on R L S 197
- Sommerfeld, M (ed), George, Hofmannsthal, Rilke 321
- Spargo, J W, see Neely, C
- Spencer, H, The Art and Life of William Shakespeare 534
- Spencer, T and Van Doren, M, Studies in Metaphysical Poetry 456
- Spitzer, L, A Fr *Escharevotée* 'Ecorchée' 447, *Le manque d'argent qui se fait rare* 332, *Rassisch-nationale Stilkunde* 16, Robert A Hall, Jr, "Italian Etymological Notes" 79, *Le Style "circulaire"* 495
- Stauffer, D A, A Parasitical Form of Biography 289
- Stevenson, N W, Paris dans la *Comédie humaine* de Balzac 157
- Stoll, E E, Modesty in the Audience 570, Poetic Alliteration 388
- Stone, G W, Jr (ed), The Journal of David Gairick 560
- Sturtevant, A M, Gothic *pus* 599
- Sypheid, W O, The Literature of the English Bible 237
- Tannenbaum, S A, Ben Jonson 238, Bibliographies 160
- Tatlock, J S F, Chaucer's Monk 350, see also 480
- Taylor, A, Problems in German Literary History of the 15th and 16th Centuries 543
- Thomas, S, "Hobgoblin Runne Away with the Garland from Apollo" 418
- Tillyard, E M W, The Miltonic Setting, Past and Present 215, — and Lewis, C S, The Personal Heresy, a Controversy 233
- Troxell, J C (ed), Rossetti's *Sister Helen* 238
- Tupper, F S, Colley and Caius Ciber 393
- Üçok, N, über die Wortgruppen weltanschaulichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Ulfilas 154
- Van Doren, M, Shakespeare 456, see also Spencer, T
- Vial, F, Une Philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, marquis de Vauvenargues 312
- Von der Muhll, E, Rousseau et les réformateurs du théâtre 161
- Wallen, M G (ed), Thomas Fuller, *The Holy State and the Profane State* 147
- Walz, J A, *Heavenfesen Faust II*, L 6199 117
- Warner, J H, The Basis of J-J Rousseau's Contemporaneous Reputation in England 270
- Warren, C T, see Clarkson, P S
- Wasserman, E R, Coleridge's "Metrical Experiments" 432, The Source of Motherwell's *Melancholye* 296
- Weber, C J, Rebekah Owen and Thomas Hardy 316
- Webster, K G T, Galloway and the Romances 363
- Wester, D, Burke's Error Regarding Sugar-Crystals 47, Edmund Burke and his Kinsmen 307.



- Malakis, E A Schinz (ed.), 19th Century French Readings 320
- Malone, K R H Bowen (ed.), *The Gast of Gy* 642, A Campbell (ed.), *The Battle of Brunanburh* 74, A Dickson (ed.), Henry Wat son (trans.), *Valentine and Or son* 242, N E Griffin (ed.), Guido de Columnis, *Historia De- structionis Troiae* 78, G Hof strand, *The Seege of Troye*, a Study 242, V F Hoppe, *Medie val Number Symbolism* 78, W Kleineke, *Englische Furstenspie gel vom Poliraticus* Johannis von Salisbury bis zum *Basilihon Doron* Konig Jakobs I 241, H Marquardt, *Die altenglischen Kenningar* 73, C Monnet (trans.), F Olivero (ed.), *Beo- wulf* 241, W Murison, Sir David Lyndsay 240, C Neely (collec- tor) and J W Spargo (ed.), *Tales and Songs of Southern Illi- nois* 402, J D A Ogilvy, *Books Known to Anglo-Latin Writers from Aldhelm to Alcuin* 240, J J Parry (ed and trans.), *Brut y Brenhnedd* 160, J Raith, *Boc- caccio in der englischen Literatur von Chaucer bis Painters Palace of Pleasure* 241, J E Wells, *A Manual of the Writings in M E* 78
- Miller, E E H Gerstner and K Schworm (eds.), *Deutsche Dich- ter unserer Zeit* 628
- Morley, S G M Romera Navarro (ed.), Gracián, *El Criticón* 556
- Morrisette, B A F Vial, *Une Philosophie et une morale du sentiment, Luc de Clapiers, mar- quis de Vauvenargues* 312
- Muller, H F A Gregoire, Edmond — Puxi — Michel, *les Prenoms de trois enfants* 621
- Nethercot, A. H T M H Blair (ed.), Banks, *The Unhappy Fa- vourite* 221
- Nicoll, A D MacMillan, *Cata- logue of the Larpent Plays in the Huntington Library* 322, R Mo- ley, *Are We Movie Made?* 322
- O'Brien, J H Peyre, *Hommes et œuvres du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle* 158
- Parker, W R J S Diekhoff (ed.), Milton on himself 215, E M W Tillyard, *The Miltonic Setting, Past and Present* 215
- Paulsen, W M Beare, *The Ger- man Popular Play Atus and the Venetian Opera* 640, M Sommer- feld (ed.), George, Hofmannsthal, Rilke 321
- Porterfield, A W N Uçok, *über die Wortgruppen weltanschau- lichen und religiösen Inhalts in der Bibelübersetzung Ulfilas* 154
- Pottle, F A A L Reade, *John- sonian Gleanings* 479
- Rollins, H E R B McKerrow, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* 150
- Rosenau, W W O Sypherd, *The Literature of the English Bible* 237
- Roulston, R B J G Robertson, *Lessing's Dramatic Theory* 630
- Secord, A W M E Campbell, *De- foe's First Poem* 314
- Selmer, C E Rooth, *Vrasmunt* 545, A Taylor, *Problems in Ger- man Literary History of the 15th and 16th Centuries* 543
- Shine, H R A E Brooks (ed.), Carlyle, *Journey to Germany, Au- tumn 1858* 638, A M Weygandt, *Kipling's Reading and its Influ- ence on his Poetry* 560
- Singleton, C S S Battaglia (ed.), Boccaccio, *Il Filocolo* 69, V Branca (ed.), Boccaccio, *Le Rime L'Amorosa Visione La Caccia di Diana* 69, L Di Benedetto (ed.), *Rimatori del Dolce Stil Novo* 626, E Panofsky, *Studies in Iconology* 478
- Sisson, C J G L Kittredge (ed.), Shakespeare, *Macbeth, Julius Caesar* 145, H Spencer, *The Art and Life of William Shakespeare* 534
- Snyder, A D E K Chambers, Coleridge 227, G McKenzie, *Or- ganic Unity in Coleridge* 227.
- Spencer, H R H Ball, *The Amaz- ing Career of Sir Giles Overreach* 77, R H Barker, *Mr Cibber of Drury Lane* 641, F T Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1642* 536, H Ten E Perry,

- Masters of Dramatic Comedy and their Social Themes 641, G F Reynolds, The Staging of Elizabethan Plays at the Red Bull Theater 1605 1625 540, J Wilcox, The Relation of Moliere to Restoration Comedy 77
- Spitzer, L H J Green (ed), *Anseys de Mes* 624, Homenaje a la memoria del Dr Rodolfo Lenz 156, W Kellermann, Aufbaustil und Weltbild Chrestiens von Troyes im Percevalroman 222, *Lingua Nostra* 469, Melanges de linguistique romane offerts à M Jean Haust 401
- Stauffer, D A F Olivero, Il pensiero religioso ed estetico di Walter Pater 232
- Taylor, A J Petersen, Die Wissenschaft von der Dichtung 65
- Thorpe, C DeW H W Garrod (ed), The Poetical Works of John Keats 546
- Tillyard, E M W P P Morand, De Comus a Satan 635, P P Morand, The Effects of his Political Life upon John Milton 635
- Williams, S T T F Currer (ed), Elizabeth Lloyd and the Whittiers, a Budget of Letters 559
- Wright, H B C K Eves, Matthew Prior 548